

THE SUCCESSION

O F

Protestant BISHOPS Asserted;

O R, T H E

Regularity of the ORDINA-
TIONS of the CHURCH of
ENGLAND Justify'd.

WHEREIN

The First Protestant Bishops are clear'd
from the Aspersions lately cast upon them by
Mr. THOMAS WARD, a Romanist, in his
Book, Intituled, *The Controversy of Ordination
truly Stated*, &c.

By DANIEL WILLIAMS, a Presby-
ter of the Church of *England*.

*Voluntas inordinate post se trahit judicium rationis, ut
verum judicetur illud quod placet.* Thomas Aquinas.

L O N D O N.

Printed for CHARLES RIVINGTON, at the *Bible
and Crown* in St. Paul's Church-Yard, MDCCXXI.

(Price Two Shillings.)



T

-37



on t
Rom
inst
thin
perl
I
ordi
are
a Co
to b
you
you
you
this
T
this





TO STEPHEN PARRY, *Esq.*
a Member of the Honour-
able House of Commons.

SIR,

Come now to give you an Account
of what I have done, in compliance
with your Desires, in the Contro-
versy of Ordination, which has al-
ready so frequently been brought up-
on the Stage by the Adherents of the Court of
Rome ; and since you have been pleas'd to be
instrumental in engaging me in this Cause, I
think I can apply myself to no Body so pro-
perly to be my Patron as to your self.

I presume we are both agreed to wave the
ordinary Style of Dedications, For I know you
are much better pleas'd to be a Patron without
a Compliment, than to want an Opportunity
to be truly such ; I shall therefore omit even
your just Praises, as well in your publick as in
your private Capacity, and rather choose to give
you some Account of the Subject debated in
this Treatise.

THE Book you put into my Hands, to which
this is an Answer, contains little or nothing

new, it is only a Collection of those little mean Quibbles and Falshoods in Fact, which have been frequently urg'd before, and have been as frequently confuted: But it is the way of the Priests and Emissaries of the Court of *Rome*, never to suffer any Controversy to drop which they once engag'd in, they make it even necessary to be supported, tho' by such low Arts which Men of Ingenuity and Sense would be loath to practise.

A very polite Writer has observ'd with respect to Philosophy, " that
BURNET'S Theory of the Earth in the Preface. " there is no Temper or Genius so improper for it, as
 " that which we call a mean
 " *and narrow Spirit*, and which the *Greeks* call
 " *Littleness of Soul*. And truly I think the same may be said of those who engage in Religious Controversies, who are possess'd with so mean, so narrow a disposition as to sacrifice the eternal Laws of Truth to the Interests of any Faction; But when this is practis'd in debates about Matters of Fact, it demonstrates the Person guilty of it to be not only very Wicked, but very Foolish; very Wicked, because it undermines the Foundation of all Confidence between Man and Man, and in a Word, is destructive of all social Virtues. Very Foolish, because Matters of Fact are generally more obvious to all Capacities than Matters of Speculation; and consequently the want of Ingenuity is much more liable to a Discovery, and more especially when the Facts are such as are acted

acted as upon a publick Stage, in the Eyes of all Men, and attested to future Generations by publick Acts of State, publick Liturgies, publick Records, and all other Requisites necessary to prove any Fact.

THIS, Sir, you'll find to have been the Case of the Author of *The Controversy of Ordination truly Stated, &c.* For when he denies that we had any Bishops or Ordinals at the beginning of the Reformation, that we were forc'd to put up with a ludicrous Consecration at the *Nag's-Head* in *Cheapside*, &c. he raises an Opposition to such Evidences as must render him and his Memory very contemptible: For who can, without a very great stretch of Fancy, believe, that our first Reformers should make Civil and Ecclesiastical Laws, whereby Consecrations should be made a necessary qualification in a Bishop towards the Possession of a Bishoprick, and compose and establish Ordinals in order to such Consecrations; and farther, that publick Registers should appear in several of our publick Offices of these Consecrations, and other Ecclesiastical and Civil Requisites incident to their Calling; and yet notwithstanding all this, to believe still further that these Laws were not submitted to, that these Ordinals were not us'd, and that our first Reform'd Bishops intruded themselves into Bishopricks, contrary to all these Laws, contrary to the testimony of all our publick Registers: This, I say, seems to be such an imposition upon such reasonable Creatures as Men

are; that none but Persons strongly addicted to the civil Interests of the Court of *Rome* can be guilty of: Before they perswade us to believe those Things, they must prove themselves to be as infallible in Facts, as they pretend to be in Faith.

But what is most observable in this Controversy, is, the several slow Steps and Degrees it took, before it attain'd to the present pitch of Perfection. In the Time of *Henry* the Eighth nothing of this Controversy was heard of; but after the Death of *Edward* the Sixth, in the *Marian* Persecution, the Covetousness of some, and the Passion of others, ignorant and weak Men, prompted them to dispute the validity of Orders, either receiv'd or confer'd by Hereticks; but they were not uniform even in this, for the poorer Priests, who had little to lose by the supposition of their want of a true Ordination, were, upon their Repentance or rather their relapse to Popery, admitted to the exercise of their Functions, only with a few Amendments agreeable with the Superstitions of those Times.

WHEN *Queen Elizabeth* came to the Throne, and those exil'd Bishops were restor'd, who had been forc'd to fly for the Christian Cause in the former Reign, there was nothing said at first against their Ordinations, so far from it, that the *Pope* himself (as you will find it observ'd in this Treatise) was inclin'd to establish our Liturgy in the vulgar Tongue, in case he should

be restor'd to his old Usurpations ; but no sooner was this found to be a thing not to be effected ; when those, who had rather be Subject to the Dominion of a Foreigner, than to their own natural Sovereign, launch'd out, in this as well as in other Controversies, into very great degrees of Extravagancy, as if the bounds of Truth and Falshood were to have been determinable only by their Humours. The only thing that surpriseth me, is, that Natives of this Soil, so remarkable for their Modesty, should in some particular Instances of that Age, betray such a want of it ; certainly Men that had such Principles, and Inclinations about them, as the *Romanish* Writers of those Times appear to have had, must have been possess'd with some other more powerful *Nosstrum* against blushing, than that which *Titus Oats* is reported to have us'd in a Morning before he publish'd some of his surprising Testimonies.

I shall not revive the Scurrilities of that Time, by troubling you with an Account of them : I shall only observe that the Subject of Ordination was but slightly touch'd upon by the Writers of that Réign. For the Story of the *Nags-Head* was not as yet invented, and the first Writer wherein I find any mention made of it, is one *Kellison*, a Man remarkable in nothing, but as the first Inventer, or at least the first Publisher of this Story in the beginning of Réign of King *James* the first : His words are these. “ The Author of the Book
 “ of the *Schism* of England, tells
 “ us how when your New Super-

Reply to Dr.
Sutcliff. p. 31.

" Intendants were to be created, they finding
 " none to Consecrate them, were fain to make
 " their Suit to a Bishop of *Ireland* to assist at
 " their Consecration, who refusing, they made
 " one another Bishops: And as I have heard
 " credibly reported, some of them were made
 " Bishops at the *Nags-Head*, with no other Ce-
 " remonies, then laying the *English Bible* on
 " their Heads.

Y O U are to observe Sir, That the latter
 part of this Passage, which relates to the *Nags-Head*, is *Kellison's* own, and not to be met with
 either in *Sanders's Book*, *De Schismate Anglicano*, which he refers to, or in any other Writer
 during the whole Reign of *Queen Elizabeth*.
 So that the Credit of this Story depends alto-
 gether upon this *Kellison's* Reputation, which,
 as he had none to lose himself, so he was the
 fitter Man to destroy the Reputation of other
 Men.

F R O M this slender foundation, all the inco-
 herent Clamours relating to a *Nags-Head* Con-
 secration took it's Rise: How it has been
 since improv'd into a Story attended by many
 Circumstances, you will find some Account of
 in this Treatise: For you must know that *Rome*
 never wanted a Genius for Improvements of this
 kind much more refin'd than any the Heathen
 World have produc'd.

B U T one would think that if there had been
 any colour for the Truth of this Story, it would
 have been sooner produc'd than the Year 1608,
 which is near fifty Years after the time it was
 suppos'd

suppos'd to be done; and what is still more remarkable, is that it was capable of Improvements afterwards. Why was it not publish'd intire at first to the World? And why no sooner? But *Rome* well knew, that such an unaccountable Tale as this would not bear the telling, while the People of the Age wherein it was Transacted did survive, and even in this, they have been unfortunate, for there happen'd to be one surviving Witness of noble Birth, who had been present at Archbishop *Parker's* Consecration at *Lambeth* Chapel, and openly testify'd the contrary to the World under his Hand when they began to impose this Story upon Mankind: For so it happen'd that the old Earl of *Nottingham* was alive when this Story came out, and we have his Certificate to the contrary in Mr. *Mason*. This single Testimony, if we had to deal with Men of any Ingenuity and Modesty, would for ever Silence this Calumny; but the Case is otherwise, and who can help it.

I am very sensible that some of the prevailing Principles of this Age would save me the Trouble of this Vindication; but since what I write is for the Information of Christians, I am the less sollicitous what Opinion others may have of the present Undertaking. Priest-craft we know is a Word of late, very much in Vogue among the more licentious part of Mankind, and therefore a Vindication of the Priesthood among such Men, may be look'd upon as no very fashionable performance; nor is this all,
there

*
there is something yet more remarkable, and that is, that any Person engaging in this Cause is sure, not only to meet with the Reproaches of those illiterate vain Men, who have no other Merit to recommend them, except a bold Prophaneness; but he will also find himself no very grateful Object to Persons who pretend Superiour Qualifications, and who ought to be Patrons and Encouragers of Religion and Virtue.

Rome has her Ends in the Vices, and Prophaneness of these Times. She has of late gain'd a very plentiful Harvest, perhaps much greater than she can boast of from the Restoration, until the late bold Revivals of Infidelity, nor is this much to be wonder'd at, it being natural for Men to run from one Extream to another, from Prophaneness to Superstition; what I now say, is not ground'd upon Speculation only; but there are also many living Instances of it now before us.

I know the *Free-Thinkers* of these times, think themselves the farthest from Superstition of any People in the World, but herein they are much Mistaken, not only upon the Account that they are generally Superstitious in their Infidelity; but also because the one is the Parent of the other, and we may presume this Reason, sway'd with some *Jesuits* of late to turn Converts, not to Christianity, but to Irreligion: All the World knows the Latitude of those Peoples Principles, and how well qualified their Consciences are for such an Undertaking. *Overturn, overturn*, is the Principle they go up-
on

on in order to Establish their Superstition ; the Effects of it are too visible.

BUT it is some comfort to the Religious part of Mankind, that the Christian Priesthood has a few remaining Patrons, such as your self, even among those in high Places, who notwithstanding the Discouragements they labour under, in some Measure upon this Account, yet dare own themselves to be Christians.

IT is for the sake of such as these that I have taken upon me the present Trouble, lest there should any doubts arise in the Minds of such Men concerning the validity of the Priesthood of the Church of *England*, whereby I doubt not, but I shall satisfy any reasonable and really Religious Disposition ; and as for those I write against, I do not despair even to convince some of them, I mean those who are Men of Honour, Men of Honesty and Men of Learning, who hate Mis-representations in Matters of Fact, whenever they find them, who, by their Birth and Education, are above such little mean Arts as those they'll find I have been forc'd to oppose. There are others indeed of my Adversaries who I have no manner of Hopes to gain upon : They are these ; the Priests, the Women, and the ignorant Laymen. I am sensible these are not to be satisfied by a much more learned Pen than mine, because the most evident Facts, when they are against them, are false ; and the most inconsistent Story when on their Side is True. I leave these to be convinc'd by a Superior Being.

THERE

THERE is one Thing that requires an Examination, and that is what Mr. *Ward* has said upon the Head of Contradictions, which he very freely lays to the Charge of the Church of *England* in her *Articles, Homilies, &c.* These Contradictions he is very loud about, and spares no Words to represent our Ecclesiastical Constitution just as he himself would have it; this is not much unlike the usage the Primitive Christians receiv'd from the Heathens of old: For they were us'd for their Diversion to have them baited in the Skins of Wild Beasts. But Mr. *Ward* has been very awkward in his Management in this, as well as in other things. He brings one Passage out of the *Homily against Peril of Idolatry*, and another out of the *Homily of the Gifts of the Holy Ghost*, which in his blind Opinion contradicts one another, because one maintains that it appeareth not by any Story of Credit, that true and sincere Preaching hath endured in any one Place above One hundred Years. But that it is evident that Images, superstition, and worshipping of Images and Idolatry have continu'd many Hundred Years. But on the other Hand in the second *Homily* referr'd to, our Church maintains, that our Saviour departing out of the World unto his Father, promis'd his Disciples to send down another Comforter that should continue with them for ever, and direct them into All Truth; which thing to be faithfully and truly perform'd, the Scriptures do sufficiently witness: Neither must we think that this Comforter was either promis'd, or else given only to the

Apo-

Apostles, but also to the Universal Church of Christ, dispers'd thro' the whole World. For unless the Holy Ghost had been always present, governing and preserving the Church from the beginning, it could never have sustain'd so many great Brunts of Affliction, with so little Damage and Harm as it hath.

THE Contradiction between these two Passages, it seems is, that whereas the first *Homily* maintains that *true and sincere Preaching* hath endured in no Place above One hundred Years, and this Latter, that true Faith, by the promis'd Assistance of the Holy Spirit, was to continue for ever. But if Mr. *Ward* had allow'd himself a little time to think, and soften'd a little the hurry of his Zeal, he might easily have disentangl'd himself, and sav'd this Blunder for another opportunity, tho' I must own, I do not find he had any Reason to be Frugal, he seems to have had enough of these for himself, and some to spare for others.

NONE can be ignorant, among the least pretenders to reading, that there were many Heresies in the earlier Ages of Christianity, nay, that no Age whatsoever was absolutely free from those noxious Weeds; and therefore the *Homily*, represents the prevailing Nature of Error, that tho' there was hardly any Age wherein true Preaching had generally prevail'd, yet there were several Ages wherein Idolatry and Worshipping of Images was almost universally practis'd; these things are Matters of Fact, which appear upon the Face of History, and therefore

therefore the Romanists ought to consider how the latter Part of the Antithesis is to be answer'd. But to conclude from hence, that the Church of Christ was not visible (which the second *Homily* contradicts) is to conclude contrary to the universal Doctrine of all Protestants; I mean Protestants in their Wits, and I am not concern'd for the rest. We do not deny the Church of *Rome* to be a true Church, and that she has maintain'd all Truths necessary for Salvation, and this we doubt not to be the Effect of the ordinary Direction of the Holy Spirit, nor doth the many notorious and damnable Errors, which she now doth, and hath for many Ages maintain'd, destroy those fundamental Truths, which she holds in Common with all Christians. This I take to be the meaning of both these *Homilies*, so that there is no such opposition between them, as Mr. *Ward* contends for.

To clear this Point further, I shall remind you of a Passage in Archbishops *Laud's Conference with Fisher*, with respect to the visibility of the Church of Christ. "That

Laud against "the whole Church cannot Err
Fisher. p. 14. "in Doctrines absolutely Fun-

"damental, and necessary to all Mens Salvati-

"on, seems to me (says he) to be the clear pro-

"mise of Christ. *St. Matth.* 16. That the Gates

"of Hell shall not prevail against it: where-

"as most certain it is, that the Gates of Hell

"prevail very far against it, if the whole Mi-

"litant Church universally taken, can Err, from,

"or in the Foundation: But then this Power

"of

of not erring is not to be conceiv'd, as if the Church *primo & per se*, Originally, or by any Power it hath of itself: For the Church is constituted of Men, and *Humanum est errare*, all Men can Err. But this Power is in it partly by the virtue of this promise of Christ; and partly by the Matter which it teacheth, which is the unerring word of God, so plainly and manifestly deliver'd to her, as that it is not possible we should universally fall from it, or teach against it in things absolutely necessary to Salvation.

THIS Sir, is the receiv'd Doctrine of our Church in this Point, and if Mr. *Ward* had read and consider'd things a little more he would not, I hope, have so rashly charg'd our Church with contradictions.

ONE thing more I have to trouble you with, and then I have done, and that is a Curiosity communicated to me by my worthy Friend *Thomas Rawlinson*, Esq; which clears the Dispute about the time of the coming out of King *Edward* the Sixths Ordinal, which Mr. *Ward* says was not publish'd till the Year 1551, which is after the time when two of Archbishop *Parker's* consecrators are suppos'd to be Consecrated by it. But I find the Ordinal publish'd in the Year 1549. The Title of it is this, *The forme and maner of Makynge and Consecratynge of Archebishops, Bishoppes and Priestes and Deacons*, 1549, and the last Page, *Richardus Grafton Typographus Regius excudebat, Mense Martii A. MDXLIX. cum privilegio ad imprimendum solum.*

THIS

THIS is a Curiosity which perhaps Mr. Ward could not easily make himself Master of, they are only to be met with in such Repositories of Rarities, as Mr. Rawlinson has with great Expence and Industry collected. But you will find Mr. Ward capable of no Excuse, notwithstanding this, for there are Evidences common enough besides to have Instructed him in the contray of what he has asserted, as you may easily Judge if you'll be at the trouble to consult the third Page of this Treatise.

I hope Sir, you'll excuse the length of this Dedication, my Design by it is to make it as useful as I can to pave the Way for what follows, as well as to express the great Respect which is due to you from

Sir, Your most Oblig'd

Humble Servant

DAN. WILLIAMS.





THE INTRODUCTION.

THOSE, who are acquainted with the Faith and Practices of the Primitive Church, can be no otherwise than sensible that the Reformation from the Corruptions of Popery in this Nation was carryed on in a more regular way, and more agreeable to the true Primitive Principles of the Christian Religion, than in any other part of Europe, where Courage, Sincerity and Piety prevail'd against the Spiritual Impositions of Rome.

THIS Adherence to Antiquity hath procured the Church of England a great many Enemies very opposite in their Principles to one another. But none have been more artful in their Assaults, than those who have Sacrificed all their Reasonable and Religious Faculties to the Interests of the Court of Rome; and all this at the Expence of Truth and Honesty: A very particular Instance of this we have now before us. This Gentleman who

The INTRODUCTION.

writes himself Thomas Ward, bath of late been very industrious, both in Prose and Verse to represent our Reformation in the most odious Colours to the World. As to his Poetical

** History of the Reformation from the time of Hen. 8. to Dr. Oat's Plot in Hudibrastick Verse. London, 1716.* *History, * I shall take no further Notice of it, especially since all Men who are acquainted with that great Turn in our Affairs, cannot but be sensible of the exactness of his Judgment in chusing to convey*

such a History as he has written to the World in the way of a Poem, for nothing short of a License from Parnassus could in any Measure excuse a Man in vending such Fables for Historical Truths.

IT is another Book since written in Prose, which is the occasion of this present trouble, tho' it is my Opinion he had much better have kept to his Verses still, or else have had a little more regard to that saying of Tully's, Ne quid falsi dicere audeat, ne quid veri non audeat.

The Title of this Book, is this. The Controversy of Ordination truly Stated, as far as it concerns the Church of England by Law established, &c. Also Contradiction authoris'd by the Canons and Articles of the Church of England, with some Reflections upon the same by Thomas Ward, Author of the History of the Reformation. London, Printed. 1719.

THERE is nothing which the Italian Faction amongst us are more artful in, than when they endeavour to perswade the World that our
Ordi-

The INTRODUCTION.

Ordinations are invalid, they will stick at no Falshoods to support this presumption, and this any Body may see who will give himself the trouble to peruse this Treatise. They know very well what an influence the want of a true Christian Ministry must have with sober understanding Christians; and if they could but once gain this Point upon us, they may then think they have effectually done our Business and their own to. But if we are not able to defend the Regularity of our Orders against any thing that such Writers can say against them, I am sure we deserve to loose all our Right to administer in Holy Things. For their principal Objections against us are founded in the most notorious Falshoods that ever were invented; so that there needs no Art but to set Matters in their true Light for our Vindication. This is what you are to expect from the ensuing Treatise where you will find the following Points truly represented.

I. The Validity of the English Forms of Ordination.

II. Their agreeableness to the ancient Forms of the Primitive Church.

III. That the Alterations made in them, in the Year 1662, are no Argument of their Invalidity before.

IV. That Archbishop Parker was Consecrated by regular Bishops.

V. What

THE INTRODUCTION.

V. What Opinion the World at that Time had of our Ordinations.

VI. That our First Bishops were true Bishops according to our Laws.

VII. The *Nag's-Head* Fable examined.

VIII. The Falshoods of the *Nag's-Head* Consecration farther prov'd.

IX. That the *Lambeth* Register is Genuine.

X. That there was no necessity to produce Registers in Queen *Elizabeth's* Days.

XI. That Episcopacy was reputed a Divine Institution in Queen *Elizabeth's* Days.

These Chapters take in all that this Writer hath said against our Orders, or indeed any other of our Adversaries. And as to the Contradictions he charges us with in our Articles, Canons, &c. I thought to have pass'd it by with Contempt, but considering what a Clamour these Men dre went to raise if any thing of theirs, tho' never so trifling, be left unanswered; you find I have taken sufficient Notice of it in the Dedication.

THE



THE
SUCCESSION
 OF
Protestant **BISHOPS**
 Asserted, &c.

CHAP. I.

*Of the Validity of the English Forms of
 Ordination.*

THE first Thing Mr. *Ward* undertakes to prove against our Church, is the Invalidity of those Forms of Ordination, which were compos'd in the Days of *Edward the Sixth*; and which continu'd in Use until the Review of the Common-Prayer in the Year 1662. For it was thought expedient at that Time, to make some Alterations in

in our Ordinals; not as if they had been defective before in the essential Parts of them, but only to avoid some unreasonable Consequences, drawn by the *Presbyterians*, concerning the Sentiments of our Church with respect to the Distinction between a Bishop and a Priest. And therefore, in short, the Question now to be discussed is, Whether our Forms before this Alteration, were valid, with respect to the Communication of the Episcopal and Priestly Powers, or no?

BURNETS
Hist. of the Re-
formation, Vol.
II. Pag. 136.

BUT before I enter upon this Point, I find myself obliged to clear some Difficulties, which this Mr. *Ward* has raised, relating to the Ordination of two of Archbishop *Parker's* Consecrators: For Mr. *Ward*, who I find is resolved to dispute every thing,

The Contro-
versy of Ordina-
tion truly Sta-
ted. Pag. 4, 5.

tells us, " That *John Scory* and *Miles Coverdale*, two of *Parker's* Consecrators, were not made Bishops, till after the abolishing of the ancient Catholick Form of Consecration, and before the new Form was devised; so that they could be Consecrated by neither of those Forms: For they (as both *Mason* and *Dr. Heylin* tell us) were Consecrated on the 30th of *August*, in the Year 1551. Whereas the Parliament that abrogated the Catholick Ordinal, began *November* the 4th, 1549, and ended *February* the 1st, after, which was above a Year and a Half before their being Consecrated. And the Parliament which authoriz'd the new Form, did not begin till *January* the 13th, 1551, which was above four Months after their pretended Consecration; so that there was then, I say, no Form in Being, whereby to Consecrate them".

BUT I must beg Leave to observe, that our Acts of Parliament give us a very different Account of this Matter; and that very Act of Parliament which Mr. *Ward* referreth to, if he

Ibid. Pag. 2.

he had given the least heed to the Words of it, would easily have cleared this Difficulty which he has raised.

THE Words of the Act are these. "That such Form and Manner of making and Consecrating of Archbishops, Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, and other Ministers of the Church, as by six Bishops and six other Men learned in God's Law, by the King to be appointed and assigned, or by the most Number of them, shall be devised for that Purpose, and set forth under the Great Seal, before the first of *April* next coming, shall be lawfully Exercised, and none other".

KEBLE'S
Statutes 30. 40.
Edwardi Sexti
Pag. 674.

Now this Parliament began the 4th of November, 1549, and ended the 1st of February following; and the 1st of *April* mentioned in this Act must be in the Year 1550; so that there was a Form in Being, a Year and five Months at least before *Scory* or *Coverdale* were consecrated Bishops; because the Parliament confin'd the Commissioners to compose the said Form before the 1st, of *April*, which was

They were
consecrated at
Croydon, Aug.
30. 1551.

in the Beginning of the Year 1550; which Form was to be set forth under the Great Seal, and to be lawfully used, and none other. Besides, the very Form it self, which was then published accordingly, is not yet quite out of Print, and is a farther Confirmation, that it was in Use long before the Time this Author asserts it to be; and Dr. *Heylin* plainly intimateth the Publication of it to be in the Year 1550.

History of the
Reformation P.
99.

THE Calumny which he casteth upon Queen *Elizabeth's* thirty sixth Article, upon this true State of the Case, plainly appeareth to be truly such. But hear what Dr. *Heylin* saith upon this whole Matter, and he is an Author of some Credit,

See the Con-
troversy of Or-
dination, &c.
Pag. 45.

even with the *Romanists* themselves. " Which Book

" (of *Ordination*) being finished, was
HEYLIN'S History Pag. 83. " made Use of without farther Autho-
 " rity, (*than what the Act I just now reci-*
 " *ted gave it*) till the Year 1552; at what Time be-
 " ing added to the second Liturgy, it was approved
 " of and confirmed, as a Part thereof by Act of
 " Parliament, *Ann. 5. Edw. 6. cap. 1.* And of this
 " Book it is, we find mentioned in the 36th Article
 " of Queen *Elizabeth's* Time: In which it is declar-
 " ed, That *whosoever were consecrated and ordered ac-*
 " *cording to the Rites thereof, should be reputed and*
 " *adjudg'd to be lawfully consecrated and rightly or-*
 " *dered.* Which Declaration of the Church was af-
 " terwards made good by Act of Parliament, in the
 " eighth Year of that Queen; in which the said Or-
 " dinal of the 3d of King *Edward* the VIth is
 " confirmed and ratified.

I think it is but a poor Shift for our Author to say, that our Book of Ordination did not come forth till the Year 1552, only because the Parliament of that Year establish'd King *Edward's* Second Liturgy, and joyn'd this Ordinal with it then, although it was publish'd, almost two Years before, as it plainly appears by the most authentick Attestations, if such Things as publick Acts of State may be allowed to be so.

IF we meet with such uncommon Usage as this is, at the very Entrance of this Book, What may we not expect, of this Kind, from such a Writer? Surely this is a Piece of stubborn Opposition, not easily to be reconciled with common Honesty.

BY this View of the Case, it plainly appears, that there was an Ordinal in Force long before *Scory* and *Coverdale* were made Bishops: The next Thing to be consider'd, is, Whether this Ordinal, itself, was valid, in order to convey the Episcopal and Priestly Character? This Mr. *Ward* denieth; for he

he seems to give up what he had asserted before, about the Time of the coming forth of the Ordinal in King *Edward's* Days. His Words are these: " But let those Forms be made in King *Edward's* First Year; it matters not, seeing they are invalid and null in themselves, as the Reader will see they are, if he considers them, they are these. *Vide Controversy of Ordination, &c. p. 6.*

The Form of ordering MINISTERS.

“ **R**ECEIVE the holy Ghost: Whose Sins thou dost forgive, they are forgiven, and whose Sins thou dost retain, they are retained; and be thou a faithful Dispenser of the Word of God, and of his Holy Sacraments. In the Name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.

The Form of making BISHOPS.

“ **T**AKE the Holy Ghost, and remember that thou stir up the Grace of God, which is in thee, by the Imposition of our Hands: For God has not given us the Spirit of Fear, but Power and Soberness.

Now I will not positively affirm, that our Author is so insincere, as to endeavour to perswade his Reader, that these two Forms are the Whole of our Ordinals, by which we confer the Priestly and Episcopal Functions in our Church; though it must be confess'd, that by the Arguments which he brings to prove the Deficiency of them, he is either not acquainted with their own Roman Ordinal, or else he is plainly guilty of such an Imposition.

BECAUSE this Part of the Ordinal for Priests is more compleat and exprefs than the Roman Ordinal is, in particular; viz. At the Time of the Imposition of Hands: The Words which they use then are these; *Receive the Holy Ghost; Whose Sins thou dost remit, they are remitted; and whose Sins thou dost retain, they are retained.* Now we use these Words, as well as they, when the Bishop lays his Hands upon the Person to be ordain'd a Priest, as you see by the first Form which he has quoted, only with this farther Addition; *and be thou a faithful Dispenser of the Word of God and of his Holy Sacraments. In the Name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.*

AND here I must appeal to all Christians, Papists as well as Protestants, to all Men of common Justice, common Honesty, and common Sense, whether these last Words, which we use extraordinary, do any way diminish from the Force of the former, which they themselves use as well as we. I am sure, all Men must own, that they are more exprefs and confined, with respect to the Office the Person is ordained to, than theirs; and consequently if these Words bear any Signification, they must add to the Force of the former, which both use in common.

BUT what need I trouble my Reader with this; for this is not the Fault the Author finds with our Ordinal; it is the Defectiveness of it that he blames, tho' it plainly appears to be more compleat than their own, if more exprefs Terms can add to the Compleatness of it; so that we must conclude, that he was either ignorant of their own Forms, or else he has condescended so low, as to insinuate, that the Form before quoted is the Whole which we use at the Ordination of a Priest.

THE Arguments he brings for the Deficiency of our Form, are these.

“ BUT

“ BUT in those Protestant Forms are
 “ not any Words that can signify, or im-
 “ ply, the Order given: For the Word *Priest*, or *Bishop*, is not once named,
 “ nor any Word equivalent thereunto, whereby to
 “ signify or denote the Power or Grace, given
 “ by Imposition of Hands, to be Sacerdotal or Epif-
 “ copal Power. For those Words, (*Receive the Holy*
 “ *Ghost*) as not being conjoyn’d with other Words, to
 “ interpret and determine to what Office, Power, or
 “ Grace, cannot alone signify or denote the Order
 “ of Priesthood given, because alone they do not
 “ express it, and they signify no more than they
 “ express.

Controversy
 of Ordination
 truly stated p. 7.

Now I must observe, in the first Place, that if
 what he sayeth here is of any Strength, it must bear
 harder upon their own Form than it doth upon ours;
 for it evidently appeareth before, that ours is more
 express than theirs is, and so is our Form for the Or-
 dination of a Bishop, as shall be made to appear
 hereafter; and therefore it may easily be concluded,
 that Mr. *Ward* hath endeavour’d to impose upon the
 World the Forms aforesaid, as the Whole of our Or-
 dinals, whereas it appeareth, by the Ordinals them-
 selves, that we, as well as they, have the Word *Priest*
 in several Parts of the Ministration: And if he insists
 upon it, that the Word *Priest* ought to be used in that
 Form, which the Bishop useth at the
 Time of the Imposition of Hands, as it
 plainly appears he doth by his Approba-
 tion of our Forms, with that Alteration
 in King *Charles* the Second’s Time, then it is evident
 as aforesaid, that they labour under the same Defect
 (if it is a Defect) as we do, and that in a more emi-
 nent Manner. But I shall farther prove, that we
 have the Word *Priest*, and the Powers of a Priest, as
 strongly express’d in our Ordinal, before the last Re-

Controversy
 of Ordination.
 p. 9, &c.

view in the Year 1662, as they need to be express'd in any Ordinal whatsoever.

IN the first Place, the Archdeacon, SPARROW'S or his Official in his stead, presents the Collection, &c. Persons to be ordain'd Priests to the Bishop, in these Words: *Reverend Father*

in God, I present unto you these Persons present, to be admitted to the Order of Priesthood. Now here we find, at the very Entrance of this solemn Action, the Design of it express'd, which is to admit the Persons presented to the Order of Priesthood. Here is one Expression of the Order design'd to be conferr'd: Again, the Bishop himself tells the Congregation, in another Part of the Office, that *these are they whom we propose, God willing, to receive this Day unto the Holy Office of Priesthood.* This is another proper Expression of the Order, wherein the Bishop declareth his Intention, when he comes afterwards to lay on his Hands, and to say, *Receive the Holy Ghost, &c.* which must plainly refer to what he here declares his Purpose to be.

IN another Part of the Office, the Bishop useth this Prayer. *Almighty God, Giver of all good Things, which by thy Holy Spirit hast appointed divers Orders of Ministers in the Church, mercifully behold these thy Servants, now call'd to the Office of Priesthood, and replenish them so with the Truth of thy Doctrine, and Innocency of Life, that both by Word and good Example they may faithfully serve thee in this Office, to the Glory of thy Name, and Profit of thy Congregation, through the Merits of our Saviour Jesus Christ, who liveth and reigneth with thee and the Holy Ghost, World without end. Amen.*

IF there were no other, this single Prayer, according to the Usage of the Primitive Church, with Imposition of Hands by an Officer duly qualified, is sufficient to convey the Priestly Office. The fourth Council of Carthage requires no more than this.

“ W H E N

" WHEN a Priest is ordain'd, the
 " Bishop shall Bless him, laying his Council Car-
 thage, 4: Can.
 " Hand upon his Head; also all the
 " Priests that are present laying their
 " Hands upon his Head, by the Bishop's Hand.

BUT our Church is yet more cautious, if Caution
 consists in being more particular; for the Bishop
 proceedeth to demand of the Persons to be ordain'd,
 whether they *be truly call'd, according to the Will of*
our Lord Jesus Christ, and the Order of this Church of
England, to the Ministry of the Priesthood?

THERE are several other Questions relating to
 their Diligence in their Calling, as Priests, which are
 clos'd by this short Benediction, and which the Bishop
 is to say.

Almighty God, who hath given you this Will to do all
these Things, grant also unto you Strength and Power to
perform the same, that he may accomplish his Work which
he hath begun in you, until the Time shall come, at the
latter Day, to judge the Quick and the Dead.

BY what you have seen of our Ordinal, you may
 easily find, how sincere Mr. *Ward* hath
 been to tell the World; " That the Controversy
 of Ordination,
 Page 7.

" Word Priest is not once named, nor any
 " Word equivalent thereunto, whereby
 " to signify and denote the Power or Grace given
 " by Imposition of Hands.

WHEREAS the Word *Priest* is no less than four
 times particularly apply'd to the Purpose of the Con-
 secration. For the whole Office is a continued Act,
 and no Part is to be consider'd separately from the
 Act

Presbyter cum ordinatur, Episcopo eum benedicente et
 manum super caput ejus tenente, etiam omnes Presbyteri
 qui præsentes sunt manus suas juxta manum Episcopi super
 caput illius teneant. *Howel's Synopsis, Can. Vol. 2.*
 Pag. 130.

Act of Consecration itself, which is the Imposition of Hands; whatever goes before, is only preparatory to that, tho' the Words, then us'd, do fully express the Power convey'd to be no other than that of the Priesthood; for none but a Priest can remit and retain Sins, or minister the Doctrine of the Sacraments; and therefore these Words that follow, are Words equivalent to the Word *Priest*, and are certainly more full than the Romish Ordinal itself is, when the Bishop lays on his Hands. I shall here, again, set both before the Reader, in order to satisfy him of the Unreasonableness of these Mens Clamours.

The *English* FORM.

Receive the Holy Ghost: Whose Sins thou dost forgive, they are forgiven; and whose Sins thou dost retain, they are retained. And be thou a faithful Dispenser of the Word of God, and of his Holy Sacraments. In the name of the Father, &c.

The *Romish* FORM.

Receive the Holy Ghost: Whose Sins thou dost forgive, they are forgiven; and whose Sins thou dost retain, they are retained.

Pontificale
Romanum Cle-
mentis. 8. Pag.
62.

THESE are the Words used at the Imposition of Hands in both Churches; and if our Form is not valid, I am sure theirs is not so; and therefore both must, in this respect, stand or fall together.

Controversy
of Ordination.
Pag. 7.

BUT Mr. *Ward* is wiser, not only than our Church, but his own too: For he says, our Saviour did not use the Words above recited: "When he made his Apostles Priests, but Ordained them by these Words, *Hoc facite*, " (Do this)". This I find is Mr. *Ward's* Form, and certainly it is one of his own choosing; for neither the Church of *Rome*, nor Ours, use it as the Form of

of Consecrating a Priest; and consequently neither do believe it to be the Form which our Saviour used when he consecrated his Apostles Priests.

A N D Mr. *Ward*, in pursuance of the same Speculation in the same Page, tells us, that our Saviour Ordained his Apostles Priests at his Last Supper. If I oppose Mr. *Ward* in this, I hope the Adherents of the Church of *Rome* will not be angry with me; for herein I not only vindicate our Church, but theirs too, against the Assaults of this mighty *Goliath*.

Bellarmino, of all the Writers that ever appear'd in the Behalf of the Church of *Rome*, is he that deserveth the greatest Regard. Now he makes Imposition of Hands an Essential of Ordination; but it does not appear that our Saviour laid his Hands upon his Apostles at his Last Supper; therefore, according to *Bellarmino*, since an Essential of Ordination was then omitted, the Apostles were not then ordained Priests. The learned Cardinal's Words are these:

“ THE Council of Trent, (which is a thing to be observed upon the account of those who think otherwise, since the holding of that Council) Session 14. Chap. 3. saith of *extream Unction*, that the Minister of it is a Bishop or Priest, rightly ordained by Imposition of Hands. And Session 23. Chap. 4. the Council hath these Words concerning the Sacrament of Order; *If any Body shall assert, that in holy Orders, the Holy Ghost is not given, and consequently that the Bishop saith in vain, Receive the Holy Ghost; let him be accursed.* The Council here doth declare, that they are then ordained Priests, and that then the Grace of the Holy Ghost is given to them, when it is said unto them, *Receive the Holy*

Ipsū etiam *Tridentinum* Concilium (quod est observandum propter eos, qui post Concilium celebratum, aliter sentiunt) Sess. 14. cap. 3. de *extrema Unctione* dicit, Ministrum extre-

“ *Holy Ghost*. But when this is said, then the Hands
 “ are laid, as it appears by the *Pontificale*, and by
 “ the Custom of the Church: Therefore the Coun-
 “ cil thought the Imposition of the Hand to be es-
 “ sential.

HERE we find Cardinal *Bellarmino* and the Council of *Trent* on our side; they think that this Form above mentioned, (and indeed so doth the *Pontificale*) is what conveys the Priestly Power, and not Mr. *Ward's Hoc facite*. It is a strange thing, that Men will presume to engage in Controversies, when they know not what they are to defend, and what they are to oppose.

WHATEVER Mr. *Ward* has said against that Part of our Form, *Receive the Holy Ghost: Whose Sins you remit*, &c. equally affects the Church of *Rome* as it doth us; for their Words are as general as ours are, both being the same, and both refer to what is before in the same Offices, and which I have already shewn with respect to ours. What I shall next observe, in Mr. *Ward*, is what he saith of those additional Words, which we have in our Form, at the Imposition of Hands, more than what they have in theirs.

“ As for those Words, (*Be thou a*
 “ *faithful Dispenser, &c.*) they are no Controversy of Ordination, &c. Page 8.
 “ more than what may be apply'd to a
 “ Deacon. They only give Authority to
 “ distribute

extremæ Unctionis esse Episcopum, aut Presbyterum rite ordinatum, per manûs impositionem. Et Sess. 23. cap. 4. de Sacramento Ordinis habet hæc verba, *Siquis dixerit per sacram ordinationem non dari Spiritum Sanctum, ac proinde frustra Episcopum dicere, Accipe Spiritum Sanctum, Anathema sit*. Ubi Concilium declarat, tunc ordinari Presbyteros, & tunc dari illis gratiam Spiritus Sancti, cum eis dicitur, *Accipe Spiritum Sanctum*. At cum hoc dicitur, manus imponuntur, ut patet ex Pontificali, & Ecclesiæ consuetudine; ergo sentiebat Concilium illam impositionem manûs esse de essentia. *Bellarmin. de Controversiis. Vol. 3. Pag. 1280.*

" distribute the Sacraments of Christ's Body and
 " Blood, but not to consecrate it, nor to offer it in
 " Sacrifice to God the Father.

No w these Words plainly refer to what went be-
 fore in the Form ; the same Person who has Autho-
 rity given him, to *remit and retain Sins*, is to do this,
 by dispensing the Word and Sacraments, which are
 the Means appointed by God to remit and retain Sins ;
 so that these Words cannot be understood any other-
 wise, than as dispensing the Word and Sacraments to
 all Intents and Purposes, for the remitting and retain-
 ing of Sins.

B U T it seems (according to Mr. *Ward*) the Nicety
 turns upon this ; That as a Deacon may assist a Priest
 in distributing the Sacraments, so consequently dis-
 pensing the Sacraments may as properly be apply'd
 to a Deacon's Commission as to a Priest's. But I must
 beg Mr. *Ward*'s Pardon in this ; for I know of no
 Power of this Nature in a Deacon's Commission, ei-
 ther by Divine or Human Authority. A Dispenser
 of the Sacraments must answer all the Ends of the
 Dispensation, otherwise he acts imperfectly ; and
 consequently this Term cannot be apply'd to a Dea-
 con, especially when it is made explanatory of re-
 mitting and retaining of Sins, which is what a Deacon
 has nothing to do with : For suppose there be no Priest
 present to consecrate the Sacrament, What sort of a
 Dispenser will a Deacon make by himself ? He that
 talks at this Rate, must either have a strong Inclina-
 tion to dispute, or else such a Cause to maintain,
 (which is indeed the Case) as can be supported by no
 better Arguments.

B U T the main Defect which Mr. *Ward* has disco-
 ver'd in our Priesthood, is yet behind ; it is, it
 seems, because he thinks our Form, at the Time of
 the Imposition of Hands, doth not express particular-
 ly a Power to consecrate the Sacrament, Ibid.
 and to offer it in Sacrifice to God the Fa-

ther.

ther. If there is such a Defect, it is what they labour under as well as we, because they mention no such Power given at their Imposition of Hands; nay, if this Writer's Judgment were of any Consequence, we are in this Particular more perfect than they; for we do give Power, at the Imposition of Hands, to *dispense the Sacraments*, which is more than they do. They have nothing like the *Word Sacrament* in their Form at all, if we consider their Imperative Form at Imposition of Hands, separate from the rest of the Ordinal, as Mr. Ward doth ours.

BUT, I presume, this Gentleman has an Eye upon another Part of the Roman Ordinal, if he knows any Thing of it, viz. *Receive Power to offer Sacrifice to God, and to celebrate Masses, both for the Living and the Dead, in the Name of the Lord. Amen.* Now this Part of their Ordinal is not used at the Imposition of Hands, but at the Delivery of the Chalice, &c. and both that Ceremony and this Form never

MORINUS came to be practis'd in the Church, till about 700 Years ago, as it appears by *de Sacris Ecclesie Ordinationibus*. P. 262. Morinus, a learned Priest of their own Church, who has publish'd a Collection of the ancient Ordinals; and therefore this can be no essential Part, unless we presume that the whole Catholick Church wanted the Essentials of Ordination for a thousand Years next after Christ; and this is a Supposition so very unreasonable, that, I think, I need say no more of it.

BUT if you take a View of our Ordinal, you'll find a Form there, even more particular than this is, with Respect to the Sacraments in general; for the Bishop with us, upon the Delivery of the Bible, makes Use of these Words: *Take thou Authority to Preach the Word of God, and to Minister the Holy Sacraments in this Congregation, where thou shalt be appointed.* Now if the Sacrament of the Eucharist be a Sacrifice, as the most

most Learned among the Protestants do maintain, here is a Commission given to execute that Ministration, notwithstanding what Mr. *Ward* may have said to the contrary. But as for their Masses for the Living and the Dead, we *know no such Custom, neither the Church of God.* They must first of all prove such Masses by Holy Scripture, or the Practice of the universal Church in her Ordinals, for a thousand Years next after Christ, to be a Part of the Commission of a Priest, before they give us any farther Trouble, or raise any farther Scruples upon this Head.

UPON the Whole then, we find that Mr. *Ward* is entirely mistaken, when he affirmeth, that we have not the Word *Priest* in our Ordinal, or any Word equivalent thereunto. Whereas it evidently appears, by what has been said before, that both the Name and Thing too are there particularly mentioned and described; and if it be insisted upon, that no such Word as *Priest* is to be found in the very Form used at the Imposition of Hands, you find that this is what they want in that Part of their Ordinal as well as we; so that they must see to it, for if their Ordinals are valid, ours must needs be so.

I proceed now to shew the Validity of our Episcopal Ordinal. The Forms used both by the Church of Rome and Us, at the Imposition of Hands, are these.

The *English* FORM.

“ Take the Holy Ghost, and remember, that thou stir up the Grace of God, which is in Thee, by the Imposition of our Hands: For God has not given us the Spirit of Fear, but of Power and Soberness.

The *Roman* FORM.

“ Take the Holy Ghost.

Pont. Roma. P. 86

Mr. *Ward* findeth Fault with this our Form, which we use at the Imposition of Hands, because “ The

“ Word

Controversy, of Ordination Page 7. " Word Bishop is not once named, nor
 " any Word equivalent thereto, where-
 " by to signify and denote the Power
 " or Grace given by Imposition of Hands
 " to be Episcopal Power".

T H I S is the same Objection which has been already considered under the Ordinal for Priests, and you see it equally affects the *Roman* Ordinal with ours; but Mr. *Ward* was cunning enough to know, that the Commonalty, for whom his Discourse is particularly calculated, had no Opportunity to consult the *Roman Pontificale*; and consequently, that they were not in a Capacity to know that we use the very Words of that Ordinal in ours, at the Imposition of Hands. But I should have thought that the same Cunning might have suggested to him, that there are others who have Opportunities to consult their Ordinals, and who would be inclined to do the World Justice, and set this Matter in it's true Light.

B U T if this Gentleman means, that there is not the Word *Bishop*, or any word equivalent thereto, in any Part of our Ordinal, any Body that will be at the Pains to consult it, will find that he is as much mistaken in this, as he has been before about the Ordinal for Priests. And because our Ordinals are not commonly published along with our *Common-Prayers*, for vulgar Use, I shall shew the several Passages in it, wherein both the Name and Office of a Bishop are particularly express'd and distinguish'd: But it shall be, as I find it in Bishop *Bramhall's* Book, for the sake of his judicious Observations upon each Particular.

The Consecration and Succession of Protestant Bishops Justified, &c. Page 223. &c.

" THE Form of Episcopal Ordination,
 " used at the same time when Hands are
 " impos'd, is the same both in their Form
 " and ours, (*Receive the holy Ghost*). And if
 " these Words be considered singly in a di-
 " vided Sense from the rest of the Office,
 there

“ there is nothing either in our Form or theirs,
 “ which doth distinctly and reciprocally express
 “ Episcopal Power and Authority. But if these
 “ Words be considered conjointly in a compound-
 “ ed Sense, there is enough to express Episcopal
 “ Power and Authority distinctly, and as much
 “ in our Form as theirs”.

“ F I R S T, two Bishops present the Bishop
 “ Elect to the Archbishop of the Province, with
 “ these Words; *Most Reverend Father in God, we*
 “ *present unto you this Godly and well Learned Man*
 “ *to be Consecrated Bishop.* There is one Expression.

“ T H E N the Archbishop causeth the King's Let-
 “ ters Patents to be produced and read, which re-
 “ quire the Archbishop to Consecrate him a Bishop.
 “ There is a second Expression.

“ T H I R D L Y, the new Bishop takes his Oath
 “ of Canonical Obedience. *I. A. B. Elected Bi-*
 “ *shop of the Church and See of C. do promise and*
 “ *profess all Reverence and due Obedience to the*
 “ *Archbishop and Metropolitcal Church of D. and*
 “ *his Successors.* This is a third Expression.

“ N E X T, the Archbishop exhorts the whole
 “ Assembly to solemn Prayer for this Person thus
 “ Elected and Presented, before they admit him
 “ to that Office, (that is, the Office of a Bishop)
 “ whereunto they hope he is called by the Holy
 “ Ghost, after the Example of Christ before he
 “ did chuse his Apostles, and the Church of *An-*
 “ *tioch* before they laid Hands upon *Paul* and *Bar-*
 “ *nabas.* This is a fourth Expression.

“ T H E N followeth the *Litany*, wherein there
 “ is this express Petition for the Person to be Or-
 “ dained Bishop; *We beseech thee to give thy Blessing*
 “ *and Grace to this our Brother elected Bishop, that*
 “ *he may discharge that Office whereunto he is called*
 “ *diligently, to the Edification of thy Church.* To

C

“ which

“ which all the Congregation answer, *Hear us,*
 “ *O Lord, we beseech thee.* Here is a fifth Ex-
 “ pression.

“ **T H E N** followeth this Prayer, wherewith the
 “ *Litany* is concluded ; *Almighty God, the Giver of*
 “ *all good Things, which by thy Holy Spirit hast con-*
 “ *stituted divers Orders of Ministers in thy Church,*
 “ *vouchsafe we beseech Thee to look graciously upon*
 “ *this thy Servant, now called to the Office of a Bi-*
 “ *shop.* This is the sixth Expression.

“ **N E X T,** the Archbishop telleth him he must
 “ Examine him, before he admit him to that Ad-
 “ ministrati^on whereunto he is called ; and maketh
 “ a solemn Prayer for him, that *God who hath*
 “ *constituted some Prophets, some Apostles, &c. to*
 “ *the Edification of his Church, would grant to this*
 “ *his Servant the Grace to use the Authority com-*
 “ *mitted to Him, to Edification, not Destruction ;*
 “ *to distribute Food in due Season to the Family of*
 “ *Christ, as becometh a faithful and prudent Steward.*
 “ This Authority can be no other than Episcopal
 “ Authority, nor this Stewardship any other
 “ Thing than Episcopacy. This is a seventh Ex-
 “ pression.

“ **T H E N** followeth Imposition of Hands by
 “ the Archbishop, and all the Bishops present ;
 “ with these Words, *Receive the Holy Ghost, &c.*
 “ And lastly, the Tradition of the Bible into his
 “ Hands, exhorting Him to *behave Himself towards*
 “ *the Flock of Christ, as a Pastor, not Devouring, but*
 “ *Feeding the Flock ;* all this implyeth Episcopal
 “ Authority. They may except against Christ's
 “ own Form of Ordaining his Apostles if they
 “ will, and against the Form used by their own
 “ Church ; but if they be sufficient Forms, our
 “ Form is sufficient.

To

To this I shall subjoin the same pious Prelates Wish. "It were to be wished, that Writers of Controversy would make more Use of their own Eyes, and trust less other Mens Citations. Ibid. Pag. 228.

Now whether Mr. *Ward's* Character comes within the Excuse even of this Wish, is what I very much question. We will presume that he did not vouchsafe to look into our Ordinals, but that he took what he has quoted out of them at second Hand: But how he can get over what Bishop *Bramhall* has here said, I know not; for he himself owns he has perused this Book, in the eleventh Page, and in several other Places of his Book; yet for all this, to say we have nothing in our Ordinal, that signifies or denotes either the Name or Office of a Bishop, is what appears to me very unaccountable.

BUT nothing can set this Matter of the Validity of our Ordinals in a clearer Light, than an Examination into the old primitive Way of Ordination; and if we have all the Requisites which they had, this will not only vindicate Ours effectually, but also demonstrate the Absurdities and Superstitions which have crept, by the Corruptions of an ignorant illiterate Age, into the present *Roman Pontificale*. And this shall be the Subject of the next Chapter,





CHAP. II.

Of the ancient Forms of Ordination.

IT is not to be expected that I should here transcribe all the old Ordinals; that Trouble would but incumber the Reader, and make this Treatise much larger than the Author of it did at first design; it shall be therefore sufficient to give a general Account of this Matter, but so, as to be particular enough with respect to the present Controversy.

O U R Blessed Saviour, before his Departure hence, invested his Apostles with those ministerial Powers which were necessary, in order to the Edification of his Church, 'till his second Coming to change her present Militant for a Triumphant Condition. The Form and Ceremony by which this Commission was convey'd, is more particularly describ'd by St. John, than by any of the other Evangelists. *As my Father hath sent me, even so send I you. And when he had said this, he breathed on them, and saith unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost, whosesoever Sins*

Chap. 20. v.
21, 22, 23.

Sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whose-soever Sins ye retain, they are retained. This was our Saviour's Manner of Ordination; but we do not find that the Apostles strictly followed it: For in their Ordinations, we find nothing mentioned besides Prayer and Imposition of Hands; which Practice, in conferring of Orders of what kind soever, always prevailed in the Church in all Ages; so that Imposition of Hands, and a Prayer suitable to the Order conferred, is undoubtedly all that is essentially requisite in Ordination; for that Imperative Form used by our Saviour, *Take the Holy Ghost, &c.* was not observ'd for many Ages in the Primitive Church.

THE Apostolical Constitutions (though undoubtedly spurious, with Respect to the Antiquity they pretend to be of) are certainly a Part of the Ancient *Αἰδασκαλίαι* of the Apostles, mentioned by Ancient Writers; and the Forms of Ordination recommended therein, are of no small Antiquity, though far from being Apostolical.

WHAT we find in these Books, with Respect to the Ordination of a Bishop, is 1st, Election by the People. 2d, The Priests, and the rest of the Congregation are demanded three Times, whether they think the Person to be Ordained, worthy of the Office of a Bishop. 3d, One Bishop, with two others standing by the Altar, and a Deacon holding the Evangelists upon the Head of the Person to be consecrated, shall say the Consecration Prayer: The Prayer is very long, and therefore I omit it, but it is such as is suitable to an Episcopal Consecration. The Prayer being ended, one of the Bishops puts the Sacrament into the

Hands of the Person Ordained, and then all salute him with the Holy Kifs; and after some Portions of Scripture are read, the Bishop, thus Ordained, salutes the Congregation in these Words, ἡ χάρις τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἡ ἀγάπη τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Πατρὸς. ἡ κοινωνία τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος μετὰ πάντων ἡμῶν. *The Grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the Love of God the Father, and the Fellowship of the Holy Ghost be with you all;* and, lastly, the then consecrated Bishop maketh a Sermon to the People.

I N the Ordinal for Priests in these Constitutions, there are no other Ceremonies used, but a Prayer suitable to the Occasion, and Imposition of Hands by the Bishop. The same Ceremonies are mentioned in those Books, which are

MORINUS
de Sacris Ordinationibus p. 43.

very unjustly attributed to *Dionysius the Areopagite*, with the Addition only of the Sign of the Cross; but these are Testimonies of uncertain Writers, who lived in an uncertain Age; so that there is no extraordinary Weight to be put upon them, any farther than to shew the Novelty of several of the Practices of the Church of *Rome* in their Ordinations.

I therefore proceed, in the next Place, to a more solid Evidence of their Novelties, than those two last mentioned, and that is the Canons of the fourth Council of *Carthage*, with respect to the Ordination of Bishops and Priests. This Council was

held in the Year of Christ 398, and there were present no less than 214 Bishops, who agreed, that in the Ordination of a Bishop, two Bishops should

hold the Gospel over his Head, and another was to pronounce the Prayer, or Benediction, and all laying their Hands upon his Head. The Number here prescribed of three Bishops, who are to assist in Episcopal Ordinations, though not absolutely necessary,

necessary, is yet a very ancient Custom; and not only mentioned by the *Constitutions* before referr'd to, but the *Apostolical Canons* do ordain, *Επίσκοπος χειροτονέσθαι ὑπὸ δύο ἢ τριῶν*, *That a Bishop should be Ordained by two or three Bishops*; which Practice is farther confirmed by the common Consent of all Churches.

MORINUS
de Ec. Ordina-
tionibus, Binius
Con. V. l. p. 6.

THE Ordination of a *Presbyter*, according to this Council, is no other than Prayer and Imposition of Hands. I have already given an Account of this in the Words of the Council in the former Chapter.

THIS is all that is essential to Episcopal and Priestly Ordination; and the Authority of a Council is sufficient to determine any reasonable Christian, with respect to ancient Usage.

"(And as Dr. *Heylen* observes,) though
"this Council be but National in it

History of the
Reformation P.
83.

"self, yet it was generally approved

"and received, as to the Form of Making and
"Consecrating Bishops and other inferior Mi-
"nisters in all the Churches of the *West*".

BUT there can be nothing which doth more evidently demonstrate the fond Innovations and Corruptions of the present *Roman* Ordinals, than a Perusal of several of the most ancient Forms of Ordination, in the *Greek* and *Latin* Churches; which *Morinus*, a Learned Priest of the Church of *Rome*, has published in his excellent Treatise, *De Sacris Ecclesie Ordinationibus*; the first *Greek* Ordinal which he has there published, is about 800 years Old; and in the Form for Ordaining a Bishop, there is nothing mentioned which the *Romanists* will think worth their while to contend for, besides Prayer, Imposition of Hands, and the

MORINUS de
Sacris Ecc. Or-
dinationibus, P.
53.

laying of the Evangelists upon the Head and Shoulder of the Person to be ordained; all which Ceremonies are used in King *Edward's* Ordinal, only with this Difference, that instead of putting the Evangelists upon the Head and Shoulder, it is here delivered into the Hand, which I suppose no Body will contend for to be an essential Difference, there being no Colour for the Divine Institution of it.

I N this Ordinal for Priests, Prayer
Ibid. Page 54. and Imposition of Hands are the only Ceremonies used which are significant: The Bishop maketh a Sign of the Cross in the Air, but this is too airy to be reputed an Essential in Ordination; besides, it has no Foundation in any divine Law, nor do the *Romanists* themselves repute this to be of any material Consequence in Ordination.

B U T to shorten this Matter as much as possible, I shall set before the Reader the imperative Forms used in the Ordination of Priests and Bishops in the *Roman Pontificale*, which we have rejected, and which those who adhere to the Interests of the Court of *Rome* lay so great a Stress upon the Want of, as if the Essentials of Ordination depended upon the Use of them.

T H E S E three Imperative Forms in the Ordination of a Priest, are in their Ordinal, and not in ours. 1. The Form of Words used when the Bishop

Pontificale Roman. Page 55. putteth on the Tippet upon the Person Ordain'd, viz. *Receive the Token of the Lord, for his Token is easy, and his Burden is light.* 2. That used at the putting on the

Ibid. Vestment, viz. *Receive the Sacerdotal Vestment, by which Charity is understood; for God is powerful to increase in thee Charity and the perfect Work.* 3. When the holy Vessels, with the consecrated

consecrated Elements, are deliver'd, they have this Form; *Receive Power to offer Sacrifice to God, and to celebrate Masses, as well for the Living as the Dead.* Ib. Page 52.

BUT if we look into the Ordinals of the *Greek Church*, as they were publish'd by *Morinus*, a Priest of their own Church, we shall find no such Forms as these in any of them; so that if the English Ordinal be invalid upon this Account, all the Ordinations of the *Greek Church* are as invalid as ours are, for they evidently labour under the same Defect. MORINUS
de Sacris Eccle-
siae Ordinationi-
bus, Pars. 2.

NOR did the *Latin Church*, for the first thousand Years, or thereabouts, use any such Forms as are now contended for by the *Romanists*: These are the Productions of a dark superstitious Age, when Ignorance prevail'd, and when it was reputed almost an Heresy for a Man to know more than his Neighbours. The Truth of this will evidently appear to those who will be at the trouble to consult the aforesaid *Morinus*.

AND as to their Way of consecrating Bishops, it is so ridiculous and antick, in several of those Instances which they differ from us, that I am really ashamed to expose such Stuff to the view of the World; at least I think it altogether unnecessary to trouble my Reader with them, it being sufficient for him to find that our Ordinal is agreeable to the most ancient Ordinals now extant in the World, and that we observe all that the fourth Council of *Carthage* thought expedient to be observ'd.

IN short, I think it sufficient, if Prayers suitable to the Occasion, together with Imposition of Hands, be used in all Ordinations; for it is this only which appeareth to me to have had the universal Suffrage of all Antiquity, and which hath always been

been reputed the essential Parts of Ordination: And
I may very well say with *Bellarmino*,

BELLARMINI
Opera. 3. T. P.
1281.

that very learned Cardinal, upon this
Occasion. *Quis enim credat tot Patres*
& Concilia, cum nihil frequentius tractent

quam Ordinationes Sacerdotum, ne semel attigisse id
quod ad essentiam Sacramenti pertinet? "Who can
"believe that so many Fathers and Councils; when
"they mention nothing so often as the Ordina-
"tions of Priests, should never once touch upon
"what belongeth to the Essence of this Sacrament?

as ours are for they evidently labour under the

same defect.

Now did the Latin Church, for the first thousand
Years, or thereabouts, use any such Forms as are
now contended for by the Romanists: These are
the Productions of a dark superstitious Age, when
ignorance prevailed, and when it was reputed al-
most an Heresy for a man to know more than his
Neighbours. These will evidently ap-
pear to those who are capable to consider

the ancient
Apostolic
it is in those In-
stances where I am really
alluded to, as being
at least I think, sufficient for him
my Reader will be agreeable to the most
to find that our ancient Ordinals are not in the World, and
that we observe all that the fourth Council of Con-
stante thought expedient to be observed.

I in short, I think it sufficient if Prayers suitable
to the Occasion, together with Imposition of Hands,
be used in all Ordinations; for it is this only
that matters to me to have had the universal
consent of all Antiquity, and which hath always
been

CHAP.



CHAP. III.

Of Alterations made in the English Ordinals, Anno 1662.

THERE is nothing which Mr. *Ward* triumphs more in, and which, he thinks, proves to a Demonstration the invalidity of our Ordinals, than the Alterations made in them, just after the Restoration of King *Charles* the Second; for he thinks it is very plain, that if they were good before, there was no need of any Alteration then. His Words are these:

“AND this the Church of *England*’s The Controversy of Ordination, &c. P. 8.
 “Officers themselves seem to have
 “been sufficiently convinc’d of, when

“in the Year 1662, soon after King *Charles* the
 “Second’s Restoration, they rejected the said invalid Form of King *Edward*’s devising, and devised
 “new ones in their Places. And again he proceeds very magisterially,

“To say those first Forms were Ibid, Page 13.
 “sufficient, and contain’d all Things

“necessary, is to say, the new ones were more
 “than sufficient, and that whatsoever they contain
 “more

“ more than the first had, is superstitious, unnecessary, and added in vain. And this is to condemn the Convocation, call'd in 1662, of great Weakness, Rashness, and of great Error.

M^R. *Ward*, I presume, thought he had here brought the Protestants to a Dilemma, either to grant the old Ordinals invalid, or else to own the Convocation in 1662 to be Rash, Weak, &c. But, by his leave, there is no need of either.

F^OR, in the first Place, to argue from the Alteration in 1662, that the old Ordinals before that Time were invalid, is not to argue like a Scholar, or a Divine; for it is a plain Argument, *a facto ad jus*, which was never admitted in the Schools, especially in such a Case as this: He must prove the old Forms were in themselves invalid, which he cannot do, without invalidating their own, and all the Forms that ever were used in the Catholick Church.

2^d, T^HE Imprudence of the Convocation is nothing to the Purpose; yet, I presume, they may as justly make Additions to our Forms, without any Reflection upon the Validity of the Old, as the Church of *Rome* may make any Additions to theirs, which, it is known, they have frequently done: And this will evidently appear to all Men, who can and will be at the trouble to consult *Morinus's* Collections of ancient Ordinals.

T^HE Words added at the Consecration of a Priest, in the Year 1662, are these: *For the Office and Work of a Priest in the Church of God, now committed unto thee, by the Imposition of our Hands.* The Addition in the Form for Bishops is this: *For the Office and Work of a Bishop in the Church of God, now committed to thee, by the Imposition of our Hands.*

N^Ow if these Additional Words are essential to Ordination, their Orders must be invalid too, because

because it evidently appears that they have nothing of this Nature in their Ordinals, at the Juncture when Hands are impos'd. But the Truth is, both their Forms and ours too are valid, notwithstanding the Want of these Additions, as any Body may gather by what has gone before. And the Reason of these Additions in the Year 1662, did not proceed from a Consciousness of the Invalidity of our Forms before, but to set aside some Occasions which ignorant *Presbyterians* took, to comfort themselves with the Validity of their own Ordinations, because that in our Ordinals they did not find any positive Distinction made between a Bishop and a Priest in the Words used at the Imposition of Hands; Ignorant *Presbyterians* I call them, because none but Men that had a very great Share of that, or of something worse, could ever conclude, from our Ordinals before the Restoration, that our Church look'd upon the Order of a Bishop and a Priest to be the same. *Burnet* gives us this Account of the Matter.

" THERE was then [*That is in* BURNET'S History of the Reformation. Vol. 2. P. 13 6. *King Edward's Time, &c.*] no express
 " Mention made in the Words of Or-
 " daining them, that it was for the one
 " or the other; in both it was said, *Receive the*
 " *Holy Ghost. In the Name of the Father, &c.*
 " But that having been since made Use of, to prove
 " both Functions the same, it was of late Years
 " alter'd, as it is now. Nor were these Words,
 " being the same in giving both Orders, any
 " Ground to infer that the Church esteem'd them
 " one Order, the rest of the Office shewing the
 " contrary very plainly.

Now, if we consider, that this History was publish'd by a Person that wanted not Opportunities to know the Reason of these Alterations from the
 very

very Persons that made them ; and besides, that the History itself was publish'd during the Lives of several that were Members of that Convocation ; we cannot but conclude this to be a very true and authentick Account of this Affair.

BESIDES, the Thing is in itself very natural, because such an Amendment could be to no other but for such an Intent as this. For it could not add to the Validity of our Orders, if they were invalid before this Time, for Want of a proper Ordinal : But the Persons that were concern'd in these Alterations were too Learned, not only not to know that, but also they were too well acquainted with the Forms of Ordination in the primitive Church, not to know that they were valid before, and consequently that there could be any need of such an Addition upon that Account.

MR. *Ward* says farther, " That it ^{Controversy} " was a very great Oversight in King ^{of Ordination,} " *Charles* the Second's Convocation, ^{Page 13.} " not to alter the 36th Article, when " they changed their Forms of Ordaining ; for it " enjoyns them yet to believe that King *Edward's* " Forms contain all Things necessary to such Ordaining and Consecrating, when, at the same " Time, themselves plainly and openly testify a " contrary Belief of them, by their rejecting them, " and making new ones.

IF there had been such an Alteration made in the 36th Article, then our Adversaries of *Rome* would have had Reason to think that we thought our Ordinals were invalid before this Alteration ; but the Article continuing now, as we find it does, shews our contrary Belief ; for, I presume, it is possible, that two Ordinals, that are not directly worded in the same Terms, may be valid Forms ; We as openly testify our Belief of the Validity of
their

their Orders, by our Practice in not Re-ordaining their Priests, or Bishops, when they come over to us, and yet they find we believe our own Orders good too ; so that all he hath said upon this Head, is grounded upon such an ignorant Proposition, as this ; that it is impossible for a Man to believe that two Ordinals, which differ in some Expressions, can be both valid.

C H A P. IV.



C H A P.



C H A P. IV.

Of Archbishop PARKER's Consecrators.

A V I N G in the foregoing Chapters proved the Validity of our Ordinals against the Cavils of this Writer, whereby I doubt not but it will appear to every impartial Reader, that it is not the Love of Truth, but Faction, has engaged him in this Cause; I proceed now to shew that those Men who used this Form at Archbishop *Parker's* Consecration, were true Bishops.

The Controversy of Ordination, P. 14, 15.

T H I S Author will by no means admit of this, tho' he should " Admit
 " that King *Edward's* Forms had been
 " valid; yet those who imposed Hands
 " on *Matthew Parker* were not made Bishops themselves by either it or any other Form. As for
 " *Coverdale* and *Scory*, it is shewn already, that
 " when they were made Bishops, we find no Form
 " in Being to consecrate them by. And as for
 " *Hodgkins*, another of *Parker's* Consecrators, it is
 " a Question whether ever there was such a Man
 " or no. But supposing all those three to have
 " been

“ been Bishops, yet none of them were *Parker’s*
 “ principal Consecrator, nor pronounced the Form.
 “ *Matthew Parker’s* principal Consecrator was
 “ one *Barlow*, who was never made Bishop by any
 “ pretended Consecration whatsoever. Nor are
 “ there any Records in Being in the World, that
 “ give the least Hint of his being ever consecra-
 “ ted. And since this Consecration is not any
 “ where register’d, nor found in any Author, it
 “ is unreasonable to have him imposed upon the
 “ Nation for a Bishop.

Y O U see here the Strength of what this Au-
 thor has said against Archbishop *Parker’s* Consecrators; and now we are to examine into the Truth of what he has here written.

1. A S to *Scory* and *Coverdale*, you’ll find that Matter set in a clear Light in the 1st Chapter; where you’ll find, by the most authentick Testimonies that any Nation can produce, viz. publick Acts of State, that there was an Ordinal in Being, (contrary to his bold, confident, not to say impudent Assertions) whereby they were to be Consecrated, and without which Consecration they were incapable, by the Laws of this Land, to enjoy the Revenues of their Bishopricks. For it appears above by Act of Parliament, that the Ordinals were set forth under the Great Seal, by the 1st of *April 1550*, and by the Register it appears that

John Scory were Consec. } *Tbo. Canterbury.*
 and *Miles* } 30th of *Aug.* } *Nich. London.*
Coverdale } 1551, by } *John Bedford.*

so that there was a Form in Being a Year and five Months before their Consecration.

B U T poor *Hodskins* is like to come off by the worst on’t; for we find Mr. *Ward* has reduced him

D

into

into a State of Nonentity; tho' it appears by *Cranmer's Register*, that he was consecrated the 9th of *December*, in the 29th Year of *Henry the VIII.* by *John Stokesley*, Bishop of *London*; *John Hilsey*, Bishop of *Rochester*; *Robert Warton*, Bishop of *St. Asaph*; all good Catholicks.

He saith *Barlow* was not consecrated, because he doth not find him register'd in *Cranmer's Register*; and he denies there ever was such a Man as *Hodgskins*, tho' his Consecration is found here. Strange Magick this! this is a Note beyond Transubstantiation. If I had been as he, since I was in this denying Humour, I would have carryed the Jest a little farther, and deny'd there were ever such Men as *William Barlow*, *Miles Coverdale*, *John Scory*, *Matthew Parker*, and so on. I would have denyed King *Edward* had any Ordinals at all, that all Acts of Parliament, publick Records, and every Thing else relating to this Matter, were forg'd by that sly Rogue *Mason*, in the Year 1613. This would have put an end to this Dispute at once; for I dare say, no Soul living would ever have answer'd him; and many a good Catholick would have believ'd him, as firmly as they believe the Saints in Heaven do hear the Prayers they make to them here on Earth.

AND therefore for once not to make a Practice of it, I will be so bold as to presume, there was such a Man as this *Hodgskins*, who was consecrated as aforesaid, Suffragan of *Bedford*; and so I shall go on to prove *Barlow's* Consecration.

His first Argument, to prove that *Barlow* never was consecrated, is because he is not found in *Cranmer's Register*; tho' at the same time, *Scory*, *Coverdale*, and *Hodgskins* are found there, yet their Consecrations must go for nothing; and because *Barlow* is not there, he was no Bishop; so that these

Records

Records; when they are for Mr. *Ward's* Purpose, are very good, and when they are against him they are not worth a Straw.

NAY, he goeth farther, and saith, there is not the least Hint of his being consecrated in any Record in the World: But how true this is, these Records, which you find here quoted, are sufficient to inform you. The first Record I present you with, is King *Henry* the Eighth's Mandate for his Consecration, directed to Archbishop *Cranmer*.

" To the most Reverend Father in God *Thomas*
 " Archbishop of *Canterbury* the King wisheth Health.
 " Know ye, that by Election lately made in the
 " Cathedral Church of *St. Asaph*, vacant by the
 " Death of *Henry Standish*, of pious Memory,
 " the last Bishop of that Place, we have given our
 " Consent and Favour to the venerable and religi-
 " ous Man *William Barlow*, Prior of *Bisham*, of
 " the Order of *St. Augustine*, in the Diocese of *Salis-*
 " *bury*, to be Bishop and Pastor of the Place afore-
 " said: And by these Presents we signify unto
 " you, that you should execute what belongs to
 " your Office in this Matter. Witness the King at
 " *Westminster*, the 22d of February, 1536.

D 2

HERE

Pro Episcopo Assavensi de Regio Assensu. Rex Re-
 verendissimo in Christo Patri *Thoma Cantuariensi* Archie-
 piscopo, totius Angliæ Primati, Salutem. Sciatis quod
 Electioni nuper factæ in Ecclesia Cathedrali *Assavensi* per
 mortem, bonæ Memoriz, Domini *Henrici Standish* ulti-
 mi Episcopi ibidem vacante, de venerabili & religioso viro
 Domino *Willielmo Barlowe*, Priore Domus sive Prioratus de
Bisham, Ordinis *S. Augustini Sarum* Diocesis, in Episcopum
 loci illius & Pastorem, Regium assensum & Favorem ad-
 hibuimus; & hoc vobis Tenore Præsentium Significamus,
 ut quod vestrum est in hac parte exequamini. In cujus, &c.
 Teste Rege apud *Westmonasterium*, 22. Feb. 1536. *Rymer*,
 Kol. 14. Page 559.

HERE is the Mandate which all our Kings send to our Archbishops in these Cases; and the Question is, Whether it appears by any publick Record, or History, that Archbishop *Cranmer* disobey'd this Mandate, or that ever he was prosecuted in a *Præmunire*, for such his Disobedience, which is so remarkable a Thing, that there must have been some publick Notice taken of it? If this appears, we may safely venture to give up the Cause.

The Laws in *Henry* the Eighth's Time were too fresh in Memory to countenance so much as the least Omission in this Kind: For there was a Law made in the 25th Year of his Reign, " That when-

soever any such Presentment, or Nomination, shall be made by the King's Highness, his Heirs, or Successors, by Virtue and Authority of this Act, and according to the Tenour of the same: That then every Archbishop and Bishop, to whose Hands any such Presentment and Nomination shall be directed, shall, with all speed and celerity, invest and consecrate the Person nominated and presented by the King's Highness, his Heirs, and Successors, to the Office and Dignity that such Person shall be presented.

Now here follows the Penalty annex'd to a Refusal of Obedience to the Mandate aforesaid.

" If any Archbishop, or Bishop, within any of the King's Dominions, after any such Election, Nomination, or Presentation, shall be signified unto them by the King's Letters Patents, shall refuse, and do not confirm, invest, and consecrate with all due Circumstance, as is aforesaid, every such Person as is so elected, nominated, or presented, and to them signified as is above-mentioned, within twenty Days next after

" the

" the King's Letters Patents of such Signification
 " or Presentation shall come to their Hands, or
 " else if any of them, or any other Person or Per-
 " sons, admit, maintain, allow, obey, do, or exe-
 " cute any Censures, Excommunications, Inter-
 " dictions, Inhibitions, or any other Process or
 " Act, of what Nature, Name, or Quality soever it
 " be to the contrary, or Let of due Execution of
 " this Act; That then every Archbishop and
 " Bishop, and all other Persons so offending, and
 " doing contrary to this Act, or any Part there-
 " of, and their Aiders, Counsellors, Abettors,
 " shall run in the Dangers, Pains and Penalties
 " of the Estatute of Provision and *Pramunire*,
 " made in the 25th Year of the Reign of *Edward*
 " the third, and in the 16th Year of King *Richard*
 " the Second.

Now this Law was made but two Years be-
 fore *Barlow's* Consecration; and I would fain
 know, what Reason any rational Man can
 frame to himself, why Archbishop *Cranmer* should
 refuse to consecrate *Barlow*, or so much as neglect
 to do it, after he had received the Letters Pa-
 tents; when by such Neglect, or Refusal, he ex-
 pos'd himself even to the highest Penalties our
 Laws can inflict upon him; and why *Barlow* him-
 self should not take care that *Cranmer* and the
 rest did their Duty; for otherwise he could not
 enjoy the Revenues of his Bishoprick, let
 Leases, or do any other Act, tho' never so much to
 his own personal Interest; for unless he sued for
 his Temporalities, nothing of this Nature could be
 done by him, and no Court either would or could
 admit of such a Suit, without the Person suing was
 actually consecrated a Bishop, that being a neces-
 sary Qualification for such a Suit, as all the Law-

yers in *England*, that know any Thing of this Matter, are Witnesses of.

THERE is one very merry Argument this Author brings against Bishop Barlow's Con-

Page 18.

secration; and that is, that "*Henry* the Eighth was a Man led by his Passions." But I would fain know which of King *Henry's* Passions were gratified by *Barlow's* want of Consecration: But it appears by the Mandate for Consecration, that the King's Passions prompted him to have him consecrated.

IT is a strange Thing that *Barlow* should be the only Bishop in all that Reign, and contrary to all Laws then in Being, that should want Consecration: This is a Thing so contrary to common Sense, that none but those, whose Inclinations are strongly bias'd against any Truth which makes against them, can give any Credit to it, especially if we consider that this Opinion is directly opposite to the Notions of all Men in that Age, and of the Bishops too; for we find him concern'd in a Consecration in the Year 1541. He was one of the three that consecrated *Arthur Buckley*, Bishop of *Bangor*, a Papist; and 'tis a Wonder, that since there were so many other consecrated Bishops, he should be pitch'd upon to do this Office, if there was then any Suspicion of his want of Consecration: But it appears farther, by publick Records, in *Henry* the Eighth's Time, in King *Edward's* Time, and in the Days of Queen *Mary*, that all these Princes had different Notions of him from what the modern Priests and Jesuits of the Church of *Rome* pretend to have; I say pretend to have, because I do not think that they believe themselves in what they say with respect to this Matter.

MASON Vind-
ciz Ecclesie An-
glicane P. 184.

You

You have already seen King *Henry's* Mandate for his Consecration; the same Prince afterwards styled him Bishop in two Instruments, upon the Removal of *Barlow* from the Bishoprick of *St. Asaph* to that of *St. David's*, in the Year 1536, as you may see by the Records underneath; the one is the Licence for electing one in his room to the Bishoprick of *St. Asaph*, the other is *Warton's Significavit*, who was *Barlow's* Successor in the See of *St. Asaph*. The Instruments, you find, are dated May the 29th, and June the 24th, Anno 1536. The Vacancy to which *Warton* succeeded, is in Terms declared

D 4

clar'd

Rex Dilectis sibi in Christo Decano & Capitulo Ecclesie nostrae Cathedralis *Affavensis*, Salutem. Ex parte vestra nobis est humiliter supplicatum, ut, cum Ecclesia nostra praedicta, per liberam transmutationem *Willielmi Barlowe* ultimi Episcopi ibidem electi, sit Pastoris Solatio destituta, alium vobis eligendi in Episcopum & Pastorem Licentiam concedere dignaremur. Nos precibus vestris in hac parte favorabiliter inclinati, Licentiam illam vobis tenore praesentium duximus concedendam; Mandantes quod talem vobis eligatis in Episcopum & Pastorem qui Deo devotus Ecclesiae vestrae necessarius, nobisque & nostro Regno utilis & fidelis existat. In Cuius, &c. Teste Rege apud *Westmonasterium* vicesimo none Die Maij, 1536. *Rymer, Vol. 14, Page 570.*

De *Significavit* pro Episcopo *Affaven.* Ibid.

Rex Reverendissimo in Christo Patri *Thoma* eadem Gratia Archiepiscopo *Canuariensi*, totius Angliae Primati & Metropolitano, Salutem. Cum nuper vacante sede Episcopali *Affavensi*, per liberam transmutationem *Willielmi Barlowe* ultimi Episcopi ibidem Electi, ad humilem Supplicationem Dilectorum nobis in Christo Decani & Capituli Ecclesiae Cathedralis *Affavensis*, eisdem per literas nostras Patentes licentiam nostram concesserimus alium sibi eligendi in Episcopum loci praedicti & Pastorem, &c.

Teste Rege apud *Westmonasterium* vicesimo quarto Die Junij, 1536. *Rymer, Vol. 14, Page 570.*

clar'd to be made; *Per liberam transmutationem Willielmi Barlowe ultimi Episcopi ibidem, &c.* And would Henry the Eighth have styl'd Barlow a Bishop in two publick Instruments, within less than six Months after his first Election, had he not known him to be a Bishop.

KING Edward the Sixth, when he translated Barlow to the Bishoprick of Bath, he styles him in the Instrument of Translation; *Reverendus Pater modo Episcopus Menevensis*: And again, *Concedimus & damus præfato Reverendo Patri Willielmo nunc Meneven. Episcopo, prædictum Episcopatum Bathon. & Wellen: Ac eundem Willielmum in Episcopum Bathon & Wellen. transferimus per præsentem, &c.* You have the Record at large in Rymer, Vol. 15, Page 169.

BUT what is most remarkable to prove him a Bishop, is the Testimony of that zealous Lady Queen Mary, who, in seven publick Instruments owns him to be such; first in her Licence to the Dean and Chapter of Wells to choose another Bishop in his room.

“ The Queen wisheth Health to our beloved in
“ Christ, the Dean and Chapter of the Cathedral
“ Church of Wells. — Our Cathedral Church of
“ Wells being now destitute of the Comfort of a Pa-
“ stor,

Regina, dilectis nobis in Christo, Decano & Capitulo Ecclesie Cathedralis Wellen. Salutem. Cum Ecclesia nostra Cathedralis prædicta per liberam & spontaneam Resignationem in Manus nostras ultimi Episcopi ibidem, jam sit Pastoris solatio destituta. --- Nos alium vobis eligendi in Episcopum & Pastorem duximus concedendum. Mandantes quod talem vobis eligatis in Episcopum & Pastorem, qui Sacramenti Literarum cognitione ad id munus aptus, Deo devotus, nobis & regno nostro utilis & fidelis, Ecclesieque nostræ prædictæ necessarius existat. In cujus, &c. Teste Regina apud Westmonasterium, 13 Martij, 1554. Rymer, Vol. 15, Page 369.

“ stor, by the free and spontaneous Resignation in-
 “ to our Hands of the last *Bishop* of that Place, we
 “ have given you Leave to choose another into the
 “ Episcopal and Pastoral Office, commanding that
 “ you choose such a *Bishop* and Pastor as is meet by
 “ his Learning in the Holy Scriptures, and fit for
 “ that Office, devoted to God, profitable and faith-
 “ ful to us and our Kingdom, and who will be
 “ useful to our Church aforesaid. In Witness where-
 “ of, &c.

“ WITNESS the Queen at *Westminster*, the 13th
 “ Day of *March*.

AND here I must beg Leave to appeal to all
 the World, whether Queen *Mary*, or her Counsellors,
 who were so violent in other Things, would have
 accepted of a Resignation from a Person that had no
 Title, by the Laws of the Land, to a Bishoprick;
 for no Man then, any more than at this Day, could
 have any Title to a Bishoprick, by our Laws, that
 wants Consecration. If this had been the Case,
 would she not rather have directed her Letters Pa-
 tents, without any more ado, to the Dean and
 Chapter, as to a vacant Bishoprick, which indeed
 would have been the Case if *Barlow* had not been
 consecrated.

A N O T H E R eminent Instance of Queen *Mary*'s
 acknowledging *Barlow* for a Bishop, is in another
 Instrument directed to the Archbishops, &c. in
 these Words.

“ THE Queen to all Archbishops and Bishops,
 “ and to all others whom it may concern, wisheth
 “ Health.

Regina, &c. Omnibus Archiepiscopis, Episcopis, vel
 aliis quibuscunque quorum in hac parte intererit, salutem.
 Vacante nuper sede Episcopali infra Ecclesiam nostram
 Cathe-

“ Health. By the late Vacancy of the Episcopal
 “ See in our Cathedral Church of *Wells*, upon the
 “ Deprivation and Removal of the last *Bishop* of
 “ that Place, the Dean and Chapter of that Church
 “ (having first sought and obtain’d our Licence to
 “ choose another Bishop and Pastor) have cano-
 “ nically chosen and nominated that discreet Man
 “ *Gilbert Bourne*, Batchelor in Divinity, to be
 “ their Bishop and Pastor, as it more fully appears
 “ by their Letters which we send you, together
 “ with these Presents.

Now here I would be glad to know whether
 Queen *Mary* would first obtain a Resignation, and
 afterwards would the rebellious Diocesans (because
 acting without and against the Consent of their Me-
 tropolitan *Cranmer*, who was then alive) have pro-
 ceeded to deprive *Barlow*, if they had not known
 him to be a Bishop: The Attempt to deprive him,
 which is directly affirm’d in this last Instrument,
 proves him, upon their own Testimony, to have
 been a Bishop.

There are five publick Instruments in *Rymer’s*
Fœdera, relating to the Restitution of the Tempora-
 lities, in five several Counties, wherein are these

Words: *Vacante nuper Episcopatu Bathon.*

Rymer, Vol. 15. Restitution: Bathon. P. 384. *Wellen. per liberam Resignationem alti-
 mi Episcopi ibidem;* so that here, in

Cathedralem *Wellensem*, per deprivationem & amotionem
 ultimi *Episcopi* ibidem, Decanus & Capitulum ejusdem
 Ecclesiæ (Licentiâ prius a nobis per eos alium eligendi in
 eorum Episcopum & Pastorem petita pariter & obtenta)
 discretum virum Magistrum *Gilbertum Bourne* Sacræ
 Theologiæ Bachalaureum in eorum Episcopum & Pastorem
 canonice elegerunt & nominaverunt, sicuti per eorum lite-
 ras, quas vobis mittimus presentibus inclusas, plenius li-
 quet, &c. *Rymer, Vol. 15, Page 376.*

all, there are no less than seven Records under Queen *Mary's* own Hand, that acknowledge him to be a Bishop; and therefore Mr. *Ward* had not truly inform'd himself in this Matter, when he saith, *There is not the least Hint of his* *Vide Supra.*

Consecration in any Records in the World. I am sure these, and those others that are before, give the strongest Hints of this Nature that can be given, unless it be the Register itself, wherein he is register'd as consecrated, which is not yet found; tho' I do not doubt but it may be found, if there were a stricter Enquiry made for it. Archbishop *Bramball* observes, that it is to be doubted, whether it was ever yet sought for farther than *Lambeth*.

But he farther observes, BRAMBALL'S
Consecration of
Protestant Bi-
shops, &c. Part 3.
"That all the other Acts do appear
"in their proper Courts; the King's

"Licence, the Dean and Chapters

"Election, the King's Letters Patents, (which is

"that you see before) the Confirmation of the

"Dean of the Arches, which all go before Consecration;

"and his doing Homage, and the Resti-

"tution of him to his Temporalities, and his En-

"thronisation, all which do follow the Consecra-

"tion, and are infallible Proofs in Law of his

"Consecration." To these we may add these Re-

ords of Queen *Mary's*, which are publick Records

of an Enemy to confirm this Matter.

Mr. *Ward* saith farther; "There *Vide Supra.*

"is no Author that mentions his Con-

"secration." I know not what he means by this,

unless he means that no Author mentions him as a

Bishop in the Time he liv'd; for it is not every

Author's Business to mention Consecrations: By

the same Rule he might deny that our Bishops now

are consecrated; but if he means that no Author

mentions him as a Bishop, I can tell him of a very

remark-

remarkable Book, publish'd not two Years after his Consecration, wherein there is mention made of his being a Bishop, and that in a very eminent Manner, The Book I mean is, *The Institution of a Christen Man*, publish'd in the Year 1537, by 21 of the Bishops of *England*, and sign'd by them, and among the rest by Bishop *Barlow*, thus, *Gulielmus Meneven*. There are two Bishops that subscribe after him. This Book I lately saw in the Hands of a learned and curious Friend of mine; but not having the Book at present by me, I can give no particular Account who the rest are: Yet this Proof extends so far as this, that he is there, by a Number of good *Catholick* Bishops, acknowledg'd as Bishop of *St. Davids*; for certainly they would not have sign'd any thing in Company with an Intruder that wanted Consecration, much more wou'd those two Bishops who sign'd after him, have given the Precedency to such a Man.

THE only Thing that has the Face of an Argument of *Barlow's* not being consecrated, is the want of a Register of it; but then you see this is supply'd by so many other unanswerable Evidences, that there can be no just Scruple rais'd upon this Head. And we see that these Men can, upon other Occasions, undervalue the Testimony of these very Registers: For you see they are not sufficient to attest the Consecrations of *Hodgskin's*, *Scory*, and *Coverdale*, and yet they must be brought in as Evidence against *Barlow*; and again, on the other Hand, we find no Record made in these Registers of the Consecration of their great *Goliab*, *Stephen Gardiner*, Bishop of *Winchester*; and, notwithstanding this Defect, he must be reputed a good Consecrated Bishop, and no doubt of it he was, notwithstanding this Omission; and you see they op-

pose *Barlow's* Consecration upon the account of the very same Defect.

In short, there appears so much of Faction in this whole Affair, that Men of Sense of all Parties must necessarily look with the utmost Contempt upon the Supporters of it.

W H A T he says farther upon this Head is of no Weight, as when he says the *Hereticks* of those Days (as he calls them) held Pag. 13. and taught, that there is no other Priesthood in the Law of Grace but Baptism; that *Henry* the eighth thought himself a Priest, that he might be Head of the Church, and that he was pleas'd with *Barlow's* want of Consecration, upon that Account, and a great deal more such Stuff as this; which, as it is directly contrary to our Laws, and the known Practice of that Time, deserves no other Answer but Contempt: It is too romantick to be oppos'd.

H E brings an Argument out of *Champney's* Book against our Ordination, which he thinks of great Weight, and that is, "If *Barlow* had been truly consecrated Bishop, the Queen, in her Letters Patents for Mr. *Parker's* Consecration, would never have put him after *Anthony Kitchen*, Bishop of *Landaff*." And again he farther proceeds: "Doubtless if Mr. *Barlow* had known himself truly a Bishop, he would have disdain'd to have been his Second in that honourable Action, seeing he should, if consecrated, have been his Senior."

I own *Barlow* was *Kitchen's* Senior by many Years, and yet such a *Punctilio* as this can be of no Force against such Arguments as have already been produced for his Consecration.

B U T this Argument, trifling as it is, has long ago receiv'd its Answer from the learned Pen of Mr. *Mason*; but it is the way of such People as I have to deal with, never to take notice of any Answers

swers which have been made to their Objections, tho' never so solid, but to continue to urge them over and over again, with a bold Air peculiar to themselves, and their foreign Education.

BUT Mr. *Ward* has one Advantage, and that is, that the Answer is in *Latin*, and so out of the Reach of those for whom his Book is design'd; or else this Reason may be his Excuse, for ought I know, and therefore I shall take the trouble to translate it.

" *BARLOW*, by reason of his Consecration
 " ought to have had the Precedence,
 " if there had not been a particular
 " Reason to the contrary. Therefore
 " it is to be observ'd, that *Anthony*
 " *Landaff* always kept the Possession of his See, nor
 " was he depriv'd of it by any of the Disturbances
 " in the Church of *England*, so that at the Date of
 " the Patent he was actually Bishop of *Landaff*.
 " But *Barlow*, altho' in the Days of *Henry* the
 " eighth he was actually Bishop, perhaps of *St.*
 " *Asaph*, but certainly of *St. Davids*, and in the
 " Reign of *Edward* the Sixth, of *Bath* and *Wells*:
 " But in the *Marian* Persecution he was fore'd to
 " leave his Bishoprick, into which another, name-
 " ly *Gilbert Bourne*, was collated; and altho' at the
 " time when *Parker* was consecrated to *Canterbury*,
 " he was chose Bishop of *Chichester*, yet he had not
 " taken Possession of it. And therefore altho' he
 " was then a true Bishop, with respect to the Cha-
 " racter, he did not actually possess a Bishoprick,
 " which Thing the Queen's Letters Patents plain-
 " ly shew. For they Style the one simply *Anthony*
 " *Landaff*, but the other neither simply *Bath* and
 " *Wells*, nor absolutely *Chichester*, but *William*
 " *Barlow* formerly Bishop of *Bath* and *Wells*, now
 " Elect of *Chichester*; and therefore for this Cause

" (if

Vindice Ecc.
Anglicanæ Lib.
 3. C. 10. P. 370.

" (if I may conjecture) *Barlow* is put after *Lan-*
 " *daff* in *Queen Elizabeth's Letters Patents*.

AND here I must appeal to all Men of Sense,
 whether this is not a very natural Account of this
 Matter.

ANOTHER Argument *Mr. Ward* brings against
Parker's Consecrators, is from *Queen*

" *Elizabeth's* dispensing with all their

" Defects and Disabilities, in her Let- The Controversy
 of Ordination,
 &c. P. 21.

" ters *Patents*.--- If the *Queen* had

" not been conscious of their Deficiency, there

" had been no need, nor any occasion of her pre-

" tending to supply what was wanting in their

" Condition, State, or Faculty. This Want, as to

" their Condition and State, could be nothing but

" the wanting of Consecration, for it is only this

" that changes their State.

THIS is a strange Assertion, that Consecration
 only changes the State of a Bishop. I wou'd fain
 know whether a Bishop that is depriv'd thinks
 himself to be in the same State as he was in before
 his Deprivation? But if our Author will confine
 the Word *State* to Consecration, I hope he will shew
 us what Authority he has to limit the Words of a
 Patent publish'd 150 Years ago, to what Construc-
 tions he is pleas'd to put upon them. But it is
 plain, by the Words of the Patent, that it refers
 only to Incapacities in the eye of our Laws. *Quæ*
per Statuta hujus Regni, aut per Leges Ecclesiasticas in
hac parte requiruntur aut necessaria sunt. And if we
 consider that *Barlow*, *Coverdale*, and *Scory*, were
 neither of them in the actual Possession of Bi-
 shopricks, there may be reason enough for such a
 Patent with respect to the Laws; for 'tis a Question
 whether any but those who are actually in the Pos-
 session of some See, can legally consecrate a Bishop,
 so as to be reputed such in the Eye of our Laws,
 Eccle-

Ecclesiastical and Civil. But it is plain, the Patent had no respect to their Consecrations, because the Act of Consecration does not derive its Power from the Laws of Man, whether they be Ecclesiastical or Civil, but from the Laws of God. And as the Patent has only respect to the former, as appears by the Words of it; therefore it cannot without manifest Violence be apply'd to the latter.

UPON the whole then we find, that the four Bishops that consecrated Archbishop *Parker*, were all regularly consecrated Bishops, *Barlow* and *Hodgkins*, in the Time of *Henry* the Eighth by the *Romish* Ordinal; and *Scory* and *Coverdale*, by that made in King *Edward* the Sixth's Time; and all this is prov'd by the most authentick Evidences that ever were produc'd in a Case of this Nature, and which must unavoidably, in the Opinion of Men of Sense, Silence the empty Gueſſes of factious Heads.





CHAP. V.

Concerning the Opinions of the Doctors, of our and their Side, of the English Consecrations.

ANOTHER Argument which he brings against our Ordinations, is the Opinion of their Church, and of some of their own Creatures, and also he brings some Testimonies out of our Writers, that they did not think Succession in Ordination necessary, &c.

1st. T H E N he says, that “ the *Catholick* Church
“ from the Beginning to this Day, ne-
“ ver accounted them Bishops, nor The Controversy of Ordination; Page 22.
“ does she look upon those by them
“ ordain’d, for any more than Laymen,
“ as is plain from their Practice of Ordaining them
“ anew after the *Catholick* Manner, and by *Catho-*
“ *lick* Bishops, when they come over, and are to
“ be made Priests in the *Catholick* Church.

Crede quod habes & habes is a mighty Ingredient in the Religion of *Rome*, it is in virtue of this mighty

E

Princi-

Principle that they have usurped to themselves the Style of the *Catholick* Church, their Bishops are *Catholick* Bishops, and every thing they do is *Catholick*; it is with such specious Words as these they amuse the Ignorant, and set such a Value upon their own Actions. They indeed reject our Orders, but then it is upon the same Principle with the old *Donatists*, and truly they are so like these and other old Heretics in the ancient Church in several other Particulars, that they are not to be distinguish'd from them in their little Quirks and Forgeries, several eminent Instances of which you have in this very Book. But if the Truth had been of their Side, it is too well known that she stands in need of no such Supports; it is purely Faction and Interest, and not Religion, which is their Ground for denying the Validity of our Orders, as will evidently appear by the *medium*, which this Mr. *Ward* brings to prove that their Church doth deny the Validity of our Orders: His Words are these;

Ibid. " WHEN Hooper, Farrer and Ridley were Degraded, they were not Degraded as Bishops, but only as Priests (for Priests they had been made in the *Catholick* Church, before they fell.) The Bishop of *Glocester*, when degrading *Ridley*, tells him, we are to deprive thee (*Ridley*) only of Priesthood, for we know thee to be no Bishop. To this *Ridley* was silent, without ever offering to assert any Episcopal Character of his, from his pretended Consecration, by King *Edward* the Sixth's Forms, which argues him not to have look'd upon himself as Bishop.

BUT here is an unhappy blunder committed in this Proof, which shews at one view the Principles of these People; for two of the Bishops here

here were actually ordain'd by their own Ordinal, and by such Bishops as were ordain'd by it too.

HERE are their Consecrations to prove it, as they are in the Register.

Nic. Ridley conf. 5. } Hen. Lincoln. MASON *Vindice*
Sept. 1547. by } John Bedford. *Eccles. Angli-*
} Tho. Sidon. *cana, p. 209.*

Robert Farrer, conf. 9 Sept. } Tho. Canterb.
1549, by } Hen. Lincoln.
} Nic. Roffen.

So that the Consecration of Ridley was two Years and a half before King Edward's Ordinal was established, and that of Farrer, above half a Year before, for King Edward's Ordinal, was not set forth till April 1. 1550. as it appears before, so that their Ordinal was then in force, and use, and no Alterations made, but in the Communion Office, as appears by our Acts of Parliament in that Time.

NOW here, we see, they reject Bishops made in every respect as their own are, excepting that of the Authority of the Bishop of Rome, which their Ignorant or Factionous Doctors then thought to be an essential, as I shall shew presently.

BUT the true Reason, as it appears to me, why they would not allow of the Consecrations of Farrer and Ridley, was not Sacred, but merely Secular, that thereby they might invalidate the Leases they had made, as Bishops of their respective Sees, so that they themselves might have the Benefit of Letting new ones. For poor Latimer, who was consecrated by the very same Ordinal, but having no Bishoprick, was vouch'd

saſ'd the Honour of a Degradation. Nor is it much to be wonder'd at, that Men professing the Religion of Rome, should sacrifice all Honour and Conscience to secular Interest; for that is evidently the principal Ingredient in the Composition of most of the Doctrines peculiar to that Church.

As to Mr. *Ward's* Observation, that *Ridley* was silent, when the Bishop of *Gloucester*, in an upbraiding Manner told him, *he was no Bishop*; and he did not pretend to assert, any Episcopal

Page 22. Character of his, from his pretended

Consecration by *Edward the VIth's* Forms; This is far from any Argument, that he did not look upon himself as Bishop; for he had no need to justify his Consecration from those Forms; nor indeed was it to any purpose to justify it from any Form, any more than it would be to Reason with Mad-men; for that unjust, and unreasonable Zeal, which the Bishop of *Gloucester* and his Fellows were enrag'd with at that Time, had a great deal of actual Madness in it. It is plain they were not actuated by the Laws of reason and Religion, when they appear'd so contradictory to themselves, when they degraded *Lati-mer*, and did not degrade the other two, who appears to have been consecrated by the same Forms: This I say is evident, if any Body will be so charitable as to suppose, that Covetousness was not at the Bottom of this whole Affair.

BUT Mr. *Ward* brings in his Catholick Doctors, as if their Opinion were of any Consequence in this Dispute. *Bristow*, *Stapleton*, and *Harding*, and the *Rhemish* Divines are brought in; but of what Consequence are these Sentiments, or rather the Words of a few exasperated Exiles, ignorant of our Laws, in Opposition to such manifest Proofs

Proofs, as I have already produced; their Objections have not the Face of an Argument; they are only confident Assertions; as for Instance, *Stapleton* tells the Bishop of *Winchester*, you are no Lord of *Winchester*, nor elsewhere, but only Mr. *Robert Hoorn*. Do these Words amount to any Proof? but some Men admire Confidence in others, because they have so great a Share of it themselves.

See *WARD'S*
Book, p. 24.

BUT *Cudseminus* (a violent Papist, who came into *England*, in the Year 1608. much about the Time when their famous *Nag's-Head* Story was invented) had a very different Notion of our Ordinations; he is so sincere as to own them to be Regular. His Words are these, "As to the State of the Calvinistical Sect in *England*, it is so form'd, as either to last a great while, or else to be chang'd on the sudden, because of the Catholick Order there, in a perpetual Series of Bishops, and a Lawful Succession of Pastors received of the Church; for the Honour of which, we are wont to call the *English Calvinists*, by a milder Name, not *Hereticks*, but *Schismaticks*."

Vide *CUDSE-*
MIUS, apud
Maximam, de
Minist. Anglic.
Page 14.

ANOTHER eminent Instance, what Opinion the Papists had of our Orders, is indeed prior to this, but much more remarkable; we find it in the Injunctions of Bishop *Bonner*, one of *Queen Mary's* unnatural Instruments. The Article of Enquiry runs thus;

Arr. 29. in
BURNET'S Re-
cords, Vol. 2.

"Whether any such as were ordain'd Schismatically, and contrary to the old Order and Custom of the Catholick Church, or being Unlawfully and Schismatically Married, after the

“ late Innovation and Manner, being not yet recon-
 “ ciled nor admitted by the Ordinary, have Cele-
 “ brated, or said, either Mass, or other Divine
 “ Service, within any Cure or Place of this City
 “ or Diocefs.

THIS Injunction, to a Person that has but an ordinary Acquaintance with the History of those Times, plainly appears to refer to the Ministers ordain'd in King *Edward's* Days; for the first Description is of those who were *ordain'd contrary to the old Order*; and as the old Order was always observ'd in King *Henry's* Time, and part of King *Edward's*, so the Persons here described, must be those ordain'd by the *New*, in the latter Part of King *Edward's* Reign. Secondly, They are farther describ'd by their being *Married*, and that Statute, which gave this Liberty to Persons in Holy Orders, was not established till the Third Year of King *Edward*.

WHAT I infer from hence is, that *Banner* did not look upon King *Edward's* Orders to be invalid, but that the ordained were to be reconciled, and admitted by the Ordinary, as real Schismatics generally were, to the Exercise of their Function in the Church. This shews, that the Nullity of our Orders was a more modern Invention, not thought of till afterward, when it was the Interest of *Rome* that they should be so reputed; for the Pope us'd many Artifices, in the beginning of Queen *Elizabeth's* Reign, to regain his former Authority in this Realm. Among the rest one was, that he would, by his pretended Apostolick Authority, confirm our then Liturgy, in the *English* Tongue, which is in effect to confirm the whole Reformation, the use of the Communion in both Kinds, &c. so that

that it appears, that Pope *Pius* the IVth, and the Church of *Rome* had then other Sentiments of our *Liturgies* and *Orders*, and the other Parts of the Reformation; but when they found no hopes of establishing the Temporal Concerns of their Holy Father here, the Case was alter'd; so that by this we may perceive upon what pitiful Grounds they deny the Validity of our Orders, being nothing else but Avarice and Ambition.

THESE are Testimonies of another Nature, from what Mr. *Ward* has produced; he has produced the passionate Expressions of a few angry Men of our own Country, who did not determine in this Point agreeable to God's Word, nor the known Practice of the Catholick Church, but to those Resentments, they were so full of, upon the account of the suppos'd Hardships they had undergone. Whereas you see I have brought the Judgment of a Man that

CUDSEMIUS.

was a Foreigner, who came over to view the State of our Church and Universities, and consequently is not to be presum'd partial in his Opinion, at least he cannot be suspected of Partiality to our Side. Again, I bring the Testimony of one of their own Bishops, who wanted not strong Resentments, acting in his Episcopal Capacity. And lastly, The Pope himself, you see, acknowledged the Validity of our Ordinals, and Orders too, or else he wou'd not have agreed to establish them by his Authority. And now I leave it to every common Reader to judge (though the Merits of the Cause doth not depend upon this) what Opinion the Catholick Church, as he calls it, had of our Orders at the beginning; how their Notions of them came to be alter'd, I have already accounted for.

BONNER.

PIUS IV.

I shall close this Head with a more modern Instance, it is the Opinion of the Doctors of the *Sorbonne*, as I find it related by the Learned Dean of *Normwich*.

Validity of the Orders of the Church of England. Page 78.

“ IN the late Times, when one *Gosse* went over to the Church of *Roma*, a Question arising about the Validity of our Orders, on his taking upon him at *Paris* to say Mass by virtue of his Orders received in our Church, it was refer’d to the *Sorbonne*, to examine the Matter; where it being fully discussed, they gave in their Opinion that our Orders were good: And this I have by the Testimony of *one now an eminent *Papist*, who some Years since told me the whole Story from his own Knowledge, he being then in *Paris* when the whole Matter was there transacted; and altho’ afterwards, as he told me the *Pope* determined otherwise of this Matter, and ordered the Archbishop of *Paris* to re-ordain him, yet the *Sorbonnists* still stuck to their Opinion that he was a good Priest by his first Ordination. And if you will know whence this Difference in the Determination arose, it was that the one proceeded according to the Merits of the Cause, and the other as wou’d best suit to his Interest, and the Interest of the Party he was to support.

WARD’S Book Page 25.

M^R. *Ward* doth in the next Place bring in some of the Doctors of our Church, speaking against the Orders of

* Mr. *Obadiah Walker* Master of *University College* in *Oxford*, who apostatized to *Popery* in the Reign of King *James* the II^d. a little before the first Edition of this Tract was published.

of the Church of Rome; they are *Whitaker, Fulk,* and *Sutcliff*, and concludes from thence, that they did not think *Parker* to have received an
Episcopal Power from the Church of Rome. Page 26.

But it is evident that he putteth a Construction upon their Words, which they will not strictly bear; for I doubt not but if I had their Books by me, I could prove, that what they say, is only against the Corruptions and insignificant ridiculous Ceremonies in the *Romish* Ordinations. For his Quotation out of *Fulk* plainly alludes to their innovating Ceremony of anointing in Ordination, when he says, "*We spit at your stinking greasy antichristian Orders.*" And if the Case is as he says, *Ibid.*

I do not think what they say so material as to rake into the Rubbish of old Libraries for their Writings to prove the contrary. They were Men well enough in their Way, but they were confin'd to the Schools, and were little acquainted with the Affairs of the World. The Case which he disputes doth too evidently appear by publick Records, Acts of Parliament, and our Publick Ordinals, for any body that takes upon him to defend our Ordinals, to condescend to seek out for such Evidences as these, to support his Cause, if they do not happen to be immediately within his Reach.

BUT if we may judge of the rest, by what Dr. *Fulke* has written upon that Head, he was very far from giving up the Cause of Episcopacy, or owning that there were no consecrated Bishops in the Church of *England*. For in his Answer to *Stapleton's Fortrefs*, where Dr. *Stapleton*, according to the bold impudent Way of Popish Writers, tells the World, *The Spiritual Rulers of the Primitive Church, were Bishops and Pastors duly consecrated; but Protestants have no Consecration,*

STAPLETON'S
 Fortrefs over-
 thrown, p. 13.

no true Bishops at all. *Fulke* enrag'd at so loud a Lye, returns this Answer; " This is another lewd
 " Slander against the Protestants, for they have
 " true Bishops, though not consecrated after the
 " Popish Manner. *Laurence*, the Second Archbishop
 " of *Canterbury*, acknowledgeth the Ministers of
 " the *Scots* and *Britains* for Bishops, although they
 " were not subject to the Church and See of *Rome*,
 " *Lib. 2. Cap. 4. Aidanus, Finanus, Colmanus*, are
 " judged of *Beda*, for true Bishops, although they
 " were divided from the Church of *Rome*, and so
 " are such Bishops as were ordain'd by them.
 But Dr. *Fulke* comes more home to the Point, in
 the 113th page of this very Book, with respect to
 our Succession from the Popish Bishops, before
 the Reformation. " The 31st Difference is Im-
 " position of Hands, which is a meer Slander, for
 " the Ceremony is us'd of us in Ordaining of
 " Ministers, likewise where he saith, that when
 " all the Popish Bishops were deposed, there was
 " none to lay Hands on the Bishops, that should
 " be newly consecrated; it is utterly false, for
 " there was one of the Popish Bishops that con-
 " tinued in his Place, there were also divers that
 " were consecrated Bishops in King *Edward's* Days.

By this you may see how far these Men are to
 be depended upon in what they write, they are
 not asham'd to belye Dr. *Fulke*, after so many
 Years rest, and Christian Burial, and I think we
 may fairly conclude that the other Protestant
 Doctors have received the same Usage.

See his Book, page 26. BUT Mr. *Ward* tells us, that it
 " was an universal Cry among the
 " Protestants at that Time, that the
 " Church of *Rome* was in Apostacy, and drown'd
 " in damnable Idolatry; that *Rome* was the
 " Whore of *Babylon*, the Pope Antichrist, &c.
 " which charge of Antichristianism, Apostacy,
 " and

“ and Idolatry, is inconsistent with the Apostolical
 “ Succession of Bishops and Priests, and with all
 “ Christian Priesthood.

As to the Idolatry of the Church of *Rome*, and consequently of the Apostasy, &c. of the Pope, and all that adhere to that Church, he'll find the Cry continu'd; and I wish with all my heart, that there were even now, any reason for an abatement of it, but this they must not expect, until they have made very considerable Abatements in their Corruptions: Indeed Mr. *Ward* would willingly, you see, flatter himself and his own Party, with a Notion that we do now no more charge *Rome* with Idolatry, or that the Pope is Antichrist, in the Sense of being an opposer of the Christian Religion.

BUT that this Charge of Idolatry, Apostasy, and Antichristianism so justly imputed to the Romanists should be inconsistent with an Apostolical Succession of Bishops is what he has yet to prove, for we deny that Heresies do disannul Holy Orders, and we have the Primitive Church on our Side, in this Doctrine, whose Practice it was to admit the *Arian* Priests, and other Heretical Ministers, to the exercise of their Functions, without any further Ordination. And this is the Foundation which we go upon in allowing of the Orders of the present corrupt Church of *Rome*, for we reject nothing but their Errors, and though they have, even in their Ordinals, introduced many corrupt Superstitious Ceremonies and Practices, yet the Providence of Almighty God hath so ordered it, that they have retain'd so much of the Apostolical and Primitive Form, as is sufficient to convey the Episcopal and Priestly Functions.

As to what he says, of the Opinions of some Protestants contrary to this, it is nothing to the purpose, for private Opinions prove no more than the

the Arguments do which they are supported by. But the Passage which he produceth out of *Burnet*, to prove that there are such private Opinions, proves less even than private Opinion it self, unless he thought we have any Regard for his own, because he refers us to *Burnet*, p. 230. Now the late Bishop *Burnet* has written a great many Books, and where to find the Passage I cannot tell, so that at present they shall pass with me; but as Mr. *Ward*'s own Words; and what Weight

Vide Cap. 1.

there can be in the Words of a Man, that has falsified Acts of Parliament, and the Date of a Publick Liturgy, &c. I leave to the Consideration of every honest Man: And as to what follows afterwards of *Jewel*'s and *Horn*'s

&c. Branding the *Roman* Episcopacy with the Character of Antichrist, this is all of a Piece with the rest; the *Pope* indeed they justly Branded with such a Character, not upon the account of his Episcopical Character, but because of his Usurpation and Tyranny over the rest of his Brethren the Bishops, which is neither founded in Scripture nor Primitive Practice; and because he both practiseth and supporteth the Idolatry and Errors of his Vassals, in opposition to the true Faith of Christ, established by Christ and his Apostles.

T H E R E is one curious Thought more which is very observeable in this Writer, I shall transcribe the Passage at large. "I do not say
Ibid, *Pag.* 26. "for all this, but that the Queen (who
"in her own Thoughts was much better principled
"towards Episcopacy than themselves were) de-
"sired to have her new Bishops Consecrated by Ca-
"tholick Bishops, and the Catholick Forms. For
"her Ambition was, That her new Reformed Con-
"gregation of *England* should bear the Face of a
"Church

“ Church, and have in it an Episcopacy and true
 “ Priesthood, which she knew the foreign Reform’d
 “ wanted ; and it was in compliance with her (not
 “ from any good Principles of their own) that
 “ *Parker* and his Collegues, made so much suit to
 “ Catholick Bishops for Consecration.

N o w I wonder what could hinder Queen
Elizabeth from having her Désires satisfied ; and all
 the World know’s she was a Lady that very well
 knew the means how to have her Désires satisfied. She
 would not in her two first Statutes have abolish’d
 all the Superstitions of *Rome*, if she did know there
 was no other way to procure good Bishops, but by
 the Administrations of the *Popish* ones ; for she
 was too cunning not to know, that these Means
 would effectually prevent those *Popish* Bishops from
 complying with her Désires : Nay, we find those
 Catholick Forms, as he is pleas’d to call them, were
 so far from being agreeable to her Désires, that
 King *Edward*’s Forms of Ordination were us’d in
 all her Reign, which she never would have permit-
 ted, if she had thought that they were Invalid.
 But this simple Suggestion is of a Piece with the
 rest of what this Author has written.

I f there were no other Reason but the great Op-
 position which Queen *Elizabeth*’s Bishops made a-
 gainst the *Puritans* ; this alone were sufficient to
 prove their good Affections to Episcopacy, and that
 it was not the Queen’s desire alone to have this Go-
 vernment Establisht. But Mr. *Ward*, according
 to the notorious Examples of *Sanders*, *Champney*,
 and the rest of that Tribe, will say any thing he
 has a Mind to, without any Sense of Shame or Blush-
 ing.



CHAP. VI.

*That our Bishops were not reputed true
Bishops according to our Laws.*

THE next Argument, which he bringeth against the Consecration of our Bishops, is some disputes among the Lawyers, whether they were legal Bishops, which, by the by, doth not at all relate to the validity of their Consecrations, with respect to the Laws of Christ: For it is one thing to be a true Christian Bishop, and another thing to be a true legal Bishop in the Eye of the Laws of *England*. And I believe it is a Case that would not be easily solv'd by the most eminent Gentlemen of the long Robe; Whether a Bishop, as our Laws now stand, who is Ordained by the *Papish* Ordinal, and by *Papish* Bishops, can sue for his Temporalities, or otherwise legally possess a Bishoprick in *England*, in virtue of such an Ordination. And tho' we do admit their Priests without any farther Ordination to hold Preferments here, yet I very much question, if this Matter were put upon the Issue; Whether they could or no, for every Man must have a Legal, as well as a spiritual Right to all Preferments in this Kingdom; and yet

yet for any Man to argue that a Man is no Christian Priest, because our Laws have not in all particulars authorized the Manner of his Ordination, is not to argue like a Christian or a Scholar: For a Man may be a regular Priest in the Christian Account, tho' he has not been Ordained by our present establish'd Ordinals. So that whatever Mr. *Ward* saith with respect to the Invalidity of our Ordinations, at the beginning of the Reformation, because our Law-makers were not cautious enough to guard against all the Objections of captious Heads, is nothing to the purpose, and doth not in the least affect the Merits of the Cause. For if our Ordinals are Valid, as I have already proved them to be, and if we had then regular Bishops to use these Ordinals, which *Barlow*, *Hodgskins*, *Coverdale*, and *Scory* plainly appear to be by what is already said, and what I shall farther urge as to this Point, this will be sufficient: For the Question is not, Whether they were sufficiently Established to Act according to our Laws, as they were then in Being, but whether they were true Bishops according to the Laws of God, if they were so, it was time enough, afterwards, to fix their Authority here by Law, without any ground for the Imputation of being called Parliament Bishops; for our Parliament doth not pretend to give them any spiritual Authority, but only to oblige the People, by a civil Sanction, to yield an Obedience to those spiritual Powers which they are already, according to the Christian Institution, invested with. For let us put the Case that *Papery* and *Papish* Bishops were to be Established here again, we must presume, the first Step in that Case to be taken, is to repeal the present Laws in Being against that Religion and their Ordinals, to set aside Ours, and to establish Theirs: And therefore I here appeal to all Men of common Sense

Sense, whether the Popular Cry of a Parliament Religion, and Parliament Bishops, may not as justly be rais'd against them, as they do at present raise the same Cry against us. We have an Instance of this in the Days of Queen *Mary*. In the first Year of that Queen, all Statutes made relating to the Reformation in the Time of King *Edward* were repeal'd, and the Religion of Rome was again establish'd, and All such

KEBLE's Stat. P. 739. 1 Mar. Stat. 2. c. 2. *Divine Service and Administration of Sacraments, as were commonly used in England; in the last Year of King Henry the VIIIth, shall be used thorough the Realm, after the twentieth Day of December, Anno Dom. 1553. and no other Kind of Service; nor Administration of Sacraments.*

IF this be not as much a Parliament Religion as ours is, I have nothing more to say. But we find no Cry so loud as this against us, though it appears to have been their own Case as well as ours.

BUT least Mr. *Ward's* Friends should think we despise his Reasons, from these Premisses, more than they deserve, I shall consider particularly what he says upon this Head.

THE first Argument he brings to prove that our Bishops were not reputed true Bishops by our Laws, is a Case out of *Brook's Novel Cases*, printed Anno 1604. who writes thus.

Controversy of Ordination. p. 28. "IT is said, that the Bishops created in the Time of *Edward VI.* were not consecrated, and therefore were not Bishops; and for this Reason, the Locations of Lands, for a certain Term of Years by them made, though confirmed also by Dean and Chapter, did not oblige the Successor, because such had never been Bishops.

Mr.

Mr. *Ward* says, we are to observe, "That the Reason given why the Law did not look upon them as Bishops, was, because they were not consecrated. But here Mr. *Ward*, (as he generally is) is mistaken, for he does not distinguish the Law from the Pleadings of the Counsel; nor was it ever heard of before, that the Arguments urg'd on both Sides by the Lawyers, were ever look'd upon as Law, for if this were the Case, then both Sides of the Question would be true, and according to Law, which is a thing impossible. *Brook* doth not report it as the Judgment of the Court, that the Bishops in King *Edward's* Time, were not consecrated, but

only *Dicitur que Evesques in Tempore*

E. 6. ne fueront Sacrés; "It is said, that the Bishops in King *Edward's*

"Time were not consecrated; and when he comes to Report what was Pleaded on the other Side, he says, *contra de Evesque deprive que fuit Evesque in fait tempore dismissalis, et confirmat fact*."

"The contrary of a Bishop who was depriv'd, who was Bishop indeed at the Time of the De-mise and Confirmation made.

BROOKE,
ASCUN'S No-
vel Cases, de
les Ans. &c.
p. 101.

So that here you see nothing that can affect the Consecrations in King *Edward's* Days, to which Time the Case here referr'd to does relate; for you see the Case is put as well to Bishops depriv'd (which is indeed the true Case) as with respect to Bishops not consecrated: For *Brook* only reports what was urg'd of both Sides, and mentions nothing of the Judgment given. And Dr. *Champney*, was so sensible of this, in his Book of the *Vocation of the English Bishops*, that though he has mentioned this Case of *Brook's* in his *English* Edition, yet he has entirely omitted it in the *Latin* one, which he afterwards

published. And perhaps the Reason of this was, that he thought any thing would go down with the *English* Papists, who are loaded with Prejudice, but would not well bear a Foreign Examination.

BUT it seems *Ridley* was convinc'd of this, " because after his Degradation from his Priesthood, he petitioned, That those Lo-

The Controversy of Ordination, P. 28.

" cations, which he had made for certain Terms of Tears, might remain valid and firm to the Possessor.

" But if he had been, or believed himself Bishop, he needed not have begg'd this as a Favour, but have demanded it as his Right. This is Mr. *Ward's* Conclusion.

BUT to talk of Law and Reason to a Rabble full of Rage, whose *ratio ultima* lay in their Broomsticks, would argue as much Weakness in Bishop *Ridley*, as in those he had to deal with: Such Men are only capable of Persuasion, but not of Argument.

I have already prov'd Bishop *Ridley* to have been consecrated by their own Ordinal, and by such Bishops as were consecrated by it too. But notwithstanding this, you see they deny him to be a Bishop. In short, they deny or affirm any thing, as their Humours and Interests lead them. What *Burnet* observes, with respect to this Matter of Ordination, is very just.

BURNET'S History of the Reformation, Vol. 2. P. 269.

" O N E thing, says he, is remarkable, both by these (*viz. Bonner's Injunctions*, and the Queen's Injunctions that they do not pretend to Re-

" ordain those that had been Ordained by the new Book in King *Edward's* Time; but to reconcile them, and add those Things that were wanting; which were the Anointing, and giving the Priestly

" Priestly Vestments, with other Rites of the
 " *Roman Pontifical*. In this Point of Re-ordaining
 " such as were Ordained in Heresy or Schism,
 " the Church of *Rome* has not gone by any steady
 " Rule: For though they account the *Greek*
 " Church to be guilty both of Heresy and
 " Schism, they receive their Priests without a
 " new Ordination. Yet after the Time of the
 " Contests between Pope *Nicolaus* and *Photius*,
 " and much more after the outrageous Heats at
 " *Rome*, between *Sergius* and *Formosus*, in which the
 " dead Bodies of the former Popes were raised and
 " dragged about the Streets by their Successors, they
 " annulled the Ordinations, which they pretended
 " were made irregularly.

" A F T E R W A R D S again, upon the great
 " Schism between the Popes of *Rome* and *Avig-*
 " *non*, they did neither annul nor renew the Or-
 " ders that had been given: But now in *England*,
 " though they only supply'd at this Time the
 " Defects, which they said were in their former
 " Ordinations; yet afterwards, when they pro-
 " ceeded to burn them that were in Orders, they
 " went upon the old Maxim, That Orders given
 " in Schism were not valid; so they did not
 " esteem *Hooper* or *Ridley* Bishops, and therefore
 " only degraded them from the Priesthood;
 " though they had been ordained by their own
 " Forms, save only the Oath to the Pope.

L E T the Reader now judge how a Man shall
 deal with such Men; sometimes they deny the
 Validity of Orders, though conferr'd by their own
 Ordinal; at other Times they deny Orders con-
 fer'd by all Ordinals, unless the Person ordain'd
 submits himself to their Superstitions, and if he
 does so, that sanctifieth him at once, as it was the

Case of several of the Clergy in King *Edward's* Time.

BUT supposing the Popish Judges, in Queen *Mary's* Days, did deny our Orders to be valid in the Eye of the Laws of *England*, what is this to the purpose of a true Christian Ordination? For if the Persons ordain'd, were consecrated by a good Ordinal, as I have prov'd King *Edward's* to be, and by good Bishops, it is sufficient, no matter for Human Laws in this Case.

WHAT is a farther Instance of the wavering uncertain Humours of these Men in the Case of Ordination, is the Certificate which *Bonner* gave *Scory*, (one of *Parker's* Consecrators) of his having renounc'd his Wife, wherein

BURNET'S
Records, Part
2. Lib. 2
See the Record
in the Appen-
dix, Num. 1.

he calls him *Dilectus Confrater noster Johannes nuper Cicestrien. Episcopus*. Our beloved Brother *John* late Bishop of *Chichester*. And will any Body imagine, that *Bonner*, who was so re-

markably zealous in his Superstition, would stile *Scory* his Brother Bishop, if he did not really know and think him a truly consecrated Bishop. Now *Scory* and *Miles Coverdale*, were two of *Parker's* Consecrators, and both ordain'd at the same Time by King *Edward's* Ordinal; and if one was a true Bishop, the other must be so too; and consequently, in *Bonner's* Opinion, we had two good Bishops at *Parker's* Consecration; besides, they must own *Barlow* and *Hodgkins*, the other two, to be good Bishops, because they were consecrated by the *Romish* Ordinal; so that here our Succession is prov'd down to *Parker*, and consequently from him down to this Day, even out of their own Mouths.

WHAT

WHAT Mr. *Ward* brings next to prove, that our Bishops were not Lawful in the Eye of our own Laws, till the Parliament of the Eighth of *Elizabeth*, is the Case of *Horn* Bishop of *Winchester* and *Bonner*. The Case, as he relates it, is thus;

"*Hoorn* tendered the Oath of Supremacy to *Bonner*, designing upon his Refusal to bring him under a *Præmunire*. The Bishop refused this Oath; upon which *Horn* proceeds against him in the Court of King's Bench, accusing him there of denying that Oath by him tendered. Bishop *Bonner* deny'd not the Fact, but Pleaded, that he had not incurred thereby the Penalty inflicted by the Law for refusing the Oath, because it was not Lawfully tender'd him: Because *Robert Hoorn*, who offer'd it to him, was no Bishop when he tendered it to him; and by the Law, no Ecclesiastical Person, who is not a Bishop, has Power to tender the Oath. Upon this the Judges of the Kingdom met at Judge *Catalin's* Chambers, in Serjeant's Inn, to consult of the Matter, and after all, were forced to admit *Bonner's* Plea good, as appears from their letting the Matter fall without any farther Process against him upon that Affair.

The Controversy of Ordination, P. 29.

BUT Mr. *Ward* is unjust to the Judges, in saying that they admitted *Bonner's* Plea for good; they only put the Cause upon this issue, in order to be try'd by a Jury, which was never done; for the Parliament interpos'd, and put the Legality of *Horn's* Consecration out of Dispute, and at the same Time skreen'd *Bonner* from a farther Prosecution at that Time.

BUT least the Reader should from hence conclude, that he was no true Christian Bishop, I shall relate this Case, as it lies before me in our Statutes.

THE Parliament of the 1st *Eliz.* that establish'd the Common Prayer, and indeed, and in effect, establish'd the Ordinal, but in

KEBLE'S
Statutes, Page
764

these general Words, " That the said Book of Common Prayer, with the Order of Service, and of the Administration of Sacraments, and other Rites and Ceremonies, should stand and be in full Force. Now *Bonner*, in his Plea, taking Advantage of these general Words, affirm'd that the Ordinal was not comprehended in them, and consequently that *Horn*, who was consecrated by it, was not therefore legal Bishop of *Winchester*, in the Eye of our Laws; there was no Pretence, upon his want of Consecration, in any other Sense than this, which appeareth by the Words of the Statute of the Eighth Year of that Queen, whereby this Ordinal was in Terms established.

KEBLE'S
Statutes, p. 816.

See the Appendix.
Num. II.

" That all Persons that have been made, or shall be made Archbishops, Bishops, &c. by the said Form and Order, are declared and enacted to be, and shall be Archbishops, Bishops, &c.

HENCE it is plain, that *Horn* was ordain'd by King *Edward's* Ordinal, otherwise he was by this Act no other than he was before; so that

Num. II.

this Act which I have given the Reader in the Appendix, is a standing Testimony, that all our Bishops were ordain'd, before the Time of this Act, by King *Edward's* Ordinal, and that consequently Bishop *Horn* was so ordain'd too; otherwise, as it appears by the whole

whole Tenor of the Statute, they were no more Legal Bishops by this, than they were before; because this Act authorizeth only such Bishops as were made by this Ordinal; and therefore it farther very evidently appears, that the Cavils rais'd by *Bonner*, and that Faction, were not upon the account of the want of any Consecration, but only that their Consecrations were not sufficiently authoriz'd by our Laws; though that is no more than a mere Cavil, because certainly the Ordinal may well be number'd among the *Sacraments, Rites, and Ceremonies of the Church of England*, establish'd by the First of *Elizabeth*; nay, the Act of Queen *Mary*, which first repeal'd this Ordinal, and annull'd it in Law, stands repeal'd to all Intents and Purposes by the Statute of the 1 *Eliz.* So that a reasonable Man would conclude, that whereas the Act, whereby it was annull'd, being repeal'd, this Ordinal must then be of the same Force it was before, in the Days of King *Edward*.

By this View, a Man may see from what slender Foundations some People will raise a Clamour, whereas it is plain, their Opposition is not reasonable, but factious.





CHAP. VII.

The Story of the Nag's Head Consecration, Examined.



MR. *Ward*, after a Romantick Account of the Shifts *Queen Elizabeth's* first Bishops were put to, to get themselves consecrated by Dr. *Creagh*, Archbishop of *Armagh*, and a great deal more such Stuff as this, which has no Foundation either in History, nor indeed in common Sense, proceeds to assert the old ridiculous baffled Tale of the *Nag's Head* Consecration. His Words are these ;

The Controversy of Ordination, &c. p. 37, 38.

“ *Parker* and his Fellows being
 “ thus balk'd of their Expectations,
 “ and now therefore out of all farther Hopes or Prospect of ever receiving Consecration from the Hands of any
 “ Catholick Bishop, resolved to make the best
 “ of

of a bad Market, and to content them-
 selves with what sort of Consecration they
 could have from the Protestant Super-inten-
 dants, who supply'd the Places of Bishops in
 the Days of King *Edward* the VIth. Here-
 upon *Parker* apply'd himself to *John Scory*,
 one who had been ordain'd a Priest truly in the
 Catholick Church, and turning over to Protestan-
 cy, had been by King *Edward's* Appointment
 prefer'd to a Bishoprick, but without Episcopal
 Consecration, by any known Form. This *Scory*
 undertook the Office, and consecrated *Parker*,
 and the rest, not by the Catholick Form (for
 this was contrary to his Principle) nor by King
Edward's Form (for this was by the Queen de-
 signedly left remaining, unlawful, and unre-
 stored, after Queen *Mary's* Repeal of it, as is
 said) but by a new *Extemporary* Form of his
 own devising. Thus far the Legend.

WHEN Men have lost all Sense of Shame, they are
 then capable of any Crime, much greater if possible
 than that of a Misrepresentation; this I fear was poor
Mr. Ward's Case, but it is a Misfortune with him
 in common with all others of the same Temper, to
 want a good Memory. In the 15th Page, *Barlow*
 is made principal Consecrator, but here in the
 38th, *Scory* alone undertakes the Office; how this
 can be reconciled, I know not, but I leave it to
 those who believe *Transubstantiation*, to do it for
 me.

As to what he saith of *Scory's* not being con-
 secrated, the Reader must consult the first Chap-
 ter, where he will find the Matter of Fact plain-
 ly proved, that he was; though very much to *Mr.*
Ward's Discredit, I own, whom you'll find there to
 be guilty of a very gross Misrepresentation of an
 Act of Parliament, in denying, that there was any
 Form

Form in Being, when Bishop *Scory* was suppos'd to be consecrated.

ANOTHER very strange Piece of History in this Passage is, that *Scory* consecrated *Parker* and the rest, not by the Catholick Form, nor by King *Edward's*, but by an *extempore* Form of his own. Here is another Instance of that Talent, which seems to have been Mr. *Ward's* Master-piece. But there is a fatal Instance in the Case of Bishop *Bonner*, that sets the Advancers of this Argument in

HEYLYN'S
History of the
Reformation,
P. 345.

a very wretched contemptible Light; and that is one of *Bonner's* Pleas, to disqualify *Horn* as a proper Minister of the Oath of Allegiance, which is this; that *Horn* being consecrated by King *Edward's* Form, which Form being abolish'd by Queen *Mary*, and not being establish'd in Terms by the Act of the 1st of *Elizabeth*, which established the *Common Prayer*; and consequently that *Horn* was no Legal Bishop of *Winchester*, and so no proper Administrator of the Oaths tender'd to him by *Horn* or his Chancellor.

Now this Plea doth suppose *Horn* consecrated by these Forms, otherwise the Plea had been ridiculous, and according to the *Nag's Head* Legend, *Parker*, and *Horn*, and *Jewel*, and several others, were ordain'd together by *Scory*, at the same Time, and in the same Place; and therefore you see Mr. *Ward* is no Changling, when he saith, that *Parker* and the rest were consecrated by *Scory*, by a new extemporary Form of his own devising.

THE Statute of the Eighth of Queen *Elizabeth*, farther shews the manifest Untruth of the *Romish* Emissaries Assertions, that *Scory* consecrated *Parker*, and the rest, at the *Nag's Head*, by a Form of his own devising. The Words of the Statute are,

are, " That the Queen had, by her
 " Supreme Authority, at divers
 " Times from the beginning of her
 " Majesty's Reign, caused divers and
 " sundry Grave and well Learned Men, to be
 " duly elected, made, and consecrated Archbishops
 " and Bishops, of divers Archbishopricks and
 " Bishopricks within this Realm, and other her
 " Majesty's Dominions and Countries, according
 " to such Order and Form, and with such Cere-
 " monies in and about their Consecrations, as were
 " allowed and set forth by the said Acts, Statutes,
 " and Orders annexed to the said Book of Common
 " Prayer before-mentioned.

Now these Words plainly refer to no other
 Orders and Ceremonies, but what were annex'd to
 the *Common Prayer*; and I leave every Body to
 judge what Forms of Ordination those were which
 were used from the Beginning of that Queen's
 Reign. By this you may easily guess what is be-
 come of Bishop *Scory's extempore* Form, at the
Nag's Head, and even of the Story of the *Nag's*
Head it self.

As to what Mr. *Ward* says, of Queen *Eliza-
 beth's* not restoring King *Edward's* Forms of Or-
 dination, till the Eighth Year of her Reign; this
 you see is bury'd in the same Grave with Bishop
Scory's Form, and the *Nag's Head* Legend; and he
 that will not be satisfied with the Testimony of the
 Lords and Commons of *England*, in a Matter of
 Fact which happened in their own Times, but
 will prefer the empty ridiculous Surmises of those
 who can believe *Purgatory* and *Transubstantiation*,
 before such Evidence; these, I say, must be aban-
 don'd, as pass'd Conviction, they must be look'd
 upon as given up, to the weak Passions of their
 own Minds, and no more to be regarded, in what
 they

they say, than a Man would do the Words of them who lodge in the best House in *Moor-fields*.

Mr. *Ward* farther proceeds in the History of the *Nag's Head* Consecration, out of Dr. *Champney's* Book of the *Vocation of Ministers*, whose Words it seems are these; "At the *Nag's Head* Tavern in

Cheapside, by accorded Appoint-
Controve sy of Ordination, P. 39. &c. "ment, met all those who were no-
 "minated for Bishopricks, vacant ei-

"ther by Death, as was that of
 " *Canterbury* only, or by unjust Deposition, as were
 " all the rest. Thither came also the old Bishop
 " of *Landaff*, to make them Bishops: Which thing
 " being known to Dr. *Bonner* Bishop of *London*,
 " then Prisoner, he sent to the Bishop of *Landaff*,
 " forbidding him, under Pain of Excommunica-
 " tion to exercise any such Power within his Dio-
 " cese, as to Order those Men: Wherewith the
 " old Bishop being terrified, and otherwise also
 " moved in his own Conscience, refus'd to proceed
 " in this Action, alledging chiefly, for Reason of
 " his Forbearance, his want of Sight, as is said
 " before. Which Excuse they interpreting to be
 " but an Evasion, were much moved against the
 " poor old Man; and whereas hitherto they had
 " used him with all Courtesey and Respect, they
 " then turned their Copy, and reviled him, and
 " call'd him doating Fool, and the like; some of
 " them saying (this old Fool thinks we cannot be
 " Bishops unless we be greas'd) to the Disgrace
 " as well of him, as to the Catholick Manner of
 " Consecration. Being, notwithstanding, thus de-
 " ceiv'd in their Expectation, and having no other
 " Means to come to their Desire, they resolv'd to
 " use Mr. *Scory's* Help, who having born the Name
 " of Bishop in King *Edward's* Time, was thought
 " to have sufficient Power to perform that Office,
 " especially

" especially in such a great Necessity ; he having
 " cast off, together with his Religious Habit (for
 " he had been a Religious Man) all Scruple of
 " Conscience, willingly went about the Matter,
 " which he perform'd in this Sort, having the Bi-
 " ble in his Hand, and they all kneeling before
 " him, he laid it upon every one of their Heads
 " or Shoulders, saying, " (*Take thou Authority to*
 " *Preach the Word of God sincerely*) and so they
 " rose up Bishops.

" This whole Relation (says he) I myself had
 " from the venerable Priest, Mr. *Thomas Bluet*, a
 " grave, learned, and prudent Man, who has
 " often assured me, that he had heard it from
 " Mr. *Neal*, a Man of great Probity and Learn-
 " ing, formerly Professor of the *Hebrew* Tongue,
 " in the University of *Oxford* ; and then, when
 " that happen'd, belong'd to the Family of Bi-
 " shop *Bonner*, who sent him to the Bishop of
 " *Landaff*, to prohibit and charge him, under
 " Pain of Excommunication, not to meddle in
 " that Sacrilegious Consecration ; and he said also,
 " that the Bishop ordered him to remain there to
 " see what the Matter would at last come to, and
 " what would be its Issue ; so that he was an Eye-
 " Witness of all that happen'd in that Matter.
 " And of this Relation, there are as many Wit-
 " nesses, as there are Priests now living, who were
 " Prisoners for the Faith, together with the said
 " Mr. *Bluet*, in *Wisbich* Castle, in which Place I
 " also have heard the same from him.

Mr. *Ward* brings *Christopher Sacrobosco*, *Fitz-*
Simons, and others, to assert this Story, but as
 they have nothing more than what you find in
 this Account, unless it be the Testimony of old
Stow, who *Fitz-Simons* says, " had
 " diligently examined after all the

Page 41.

" Cir.

“Circumstances of it (though he durst not give
“the Relation of it in his Chronicles) has
testified the same Thing; and therefore, for my
Reader's Ease, I shall omit the rest, since all that
they say, with respect to this Matter, is com-
prehended in this Account of *Champney's*.

THE first Thing observable in this Account, is
the Place they choose for their Consecration, which
we find is the *Nag's Head* in *Cheapside*. This ap-
pears, at first View, to be so like an Old Woman's
Gossiping Story; that Men of Sense must needs
reject it: For what need had they to be conse-
crated at a Tavern, when all the Churches in
England, at that Time, were at their Command?
Besides, if the Consecration was to have been
clandestine, they would never have chose so pub-
lick a Place as a Tavern for such a Purpose;
and we may suppose the Bishop of *Landaff*, who
was to have been their Consecrator, had so much
of the good Catholick remaining in him, as not to
have been perswaded to perform such a Ceremony
in such a Place,

THE next Thing is, That Bishop *Bonner*
should send his Chaplain *Neal*, to threaten the
Bishop of *Landaff* with Excommunication, if he
should offer to ordain within his Diocese.

IF we consider, that *Bonner* is suppos'd to be
in Prison at this Juncture, and therefore conse-
quently it is not probable, that a Man in his Cir-
cumstances should keep a Chaplain, and that if
he did, that the Bishop of *Landaff* should be
frightned by the Threats of a Man, who may
reasonably be suppos'd to be almost in the lowest
Condition of Life; for all Men well know, that
the Thunder of Excommunication is of little Force,
when not arm'd with Power, at least when it has
for its Object a Person so complying with the
Times,

Times, as the Bishop of *Landaff* is describ'd to be; and supposing all this, yet if we consider, that the Consecrator, and the Persons to be consecrated, were not absolutely confin'd, either to the *Nag's Head*, or even to the Diocese of *London*, if we must strain Reason so far, as to suppose, that *Bonner*, in his then Circumstances, had any Power in that District, yet was not *Lambeth Chappel*, or any other Place, not within that Jurisdiction, near enough, to avoid any Resentments of this Nature, that could be fear'd from him?

THESE are Objections strong enough to destroy the Credit of this Part of the Story, yet greater still remain; for by such an Obstruction as this, both *Bonner* and *Neal* too ran themselves into the Guilt and Penalties of a *Præmunire*, establish'd by a Statute already referr'd to, in *Henry the VIIIth's* Time, and established and confirmed by Queen *Elizabeth*, before the Time that this ridiculous Story is suppos'd to be acted. But we do not find that either *Bonner* or *Neal* were ever Su'd upon this Statute, which No-body could suppose, but that the Persons offended would have readily put in Execution, if this had been the Case; and therefore we may safely conclude this to be one (among many more) of the *Roman Forgeries*.

ANOTHER thing to be observ'd, is the Manner of *Scory's* consecrating them, by laying the Bible upon their Heads, or Shoulders, saying, *Take thou Authority to preach the Word of God sincerely*: and so they rose up Bishops.

THERE is one Circumstance in this very remarkable, and that is, that *Scory* should invent no other Form than this, which only gives Authority to preach the Word of God, which Authority they had before, by Popish Ordination,

as Priests; whereas one would think, that he would either have used King *Edward's* Form, which was that he himself was consecrated by; or else, if *Scory* must make a Form of his own, he would have us'd one more to the Purpose of Episcopal Ordination than this is.

ANOTHER strange Thing is, that Mr. *Neal*, who was the Eye-Witness of all this, could not distinguish whether the Bible was laid upon the Head or Shoulder, (for you see the Legend leaves that uncertain) it is wonderful, that he should not strictly observe the only Ceremony then us'd, especially, since he was commanded by his Diocesan and Lord, to be there, to observe all Things, that were done, it is a Sign, that he was but a very careless Spectator; and what is still more wonderful is, that *Bonner* himself, whom we must suppose fully inform'd of this Matter, did not put this odd Consecration into his Plea, instead of that by King *Edward's* Form; it had been much more to his Purpose, if it had been Matter of Fact, for this would have effectually destroy'd *Horn's* Consecration, with respect to the Legality of it, it being a very disputable Point, to urge the Illegality of the Consecration, because he was consecrated by King *Edward's* Forms; especially, because it was not founded upon Matter of Fact, if *Horn* was consecrated, as aforesaid, by *Scory*.

I have already observed, that sometimes, when these Men are in the Humour, they make *Barlow* the Consecrator; but here they make *Scory* to be the Man. What shall Man say to such Contradictions?

WE are farther told, that this Story was handed down by a Popish Tradition, by one *Bluet*, and this *Bluet*, had it from *Neal* the Eye-Witness; but

but you see this Eye-Witness could have no other account of the only Ceremony us'd at this Consecration ; but what was very uncertain, that it was either this Ceremony or that, he could not tell which : A very proper Witness indeed, to attest a Matter of Fact, especially when he was sent thither on purpose, to see and give an account of what was done.* Besides, it is strange, that he should not inform *Bonner* of this Matter, who was the very Person that sent him ; if he had, *Bonner* would never have grounded his Plea upon a Falshood, which was, that *Horn* was consecrated by King *Edward's* Liturgy ; whereas if this Story be true, Bishop *Bonner's* Plea was false, and therefore either this Catholick Bishop's Veracity, before a Court of Justice, when all this must have been fresh in Memory, must be called in Question, or else this *Nag's Head* Relation must fall to the Ground.

WE are further told, that there are as many Witnesses of this Relation, as there were Priests then living, who were Prisoners with *Bluet* in *Wisbich* Castle. I shall not inquire into their Numbers now, but I shall only observe, that all terminates in the Credibility of *Neal*, for he is said to have told it to *Bluet*, and he to all the rest. But you see what sort of a Witness *Neal* was, who could not inform his own Master, who sent him to know what was done ; and therefore I rather conclude this to be an invention of about Forty Years afterwards, and that *Neal* knew nothing of this Matter, as I shall prove in the next Chapter.

POOR old *Stow* is brought in by Head and Shoulders, as another Witness to this *Nag's Head* Business.

The Controversy
of Ordination,
Page 22.

Business. The Syllogism runs thus, *John Stow* taketh no Notice of Archbishop *Parker's* Consecration. But he does take Notice of Cardinal *Pole's* Consecration, therefore Archbishop *Parker* was ordain'd, as aforesaid, at the *Nag's Head*. This my Reader will think is very nicely concluded, but I beg leave to draw up one Syllogism my self. *John Stow* takes no Notice of the Consecration of any Archbishop from *Augustine's* Time down to Cardinal *Pole's*; but he does take Notice of Cardinal *Pole's*: Therefore there was never any Archbishop in *England* besides Cardinal *Pole*.

I appeal to the Reader, if my Conclusion is not as fairly drawn as his, from *John Stow's* Silence, and I further appeal to the Readers of his Book, whether I have done him any Injustice in the first Syllogism, which I have drawn up for him, and whether it contains not the whole of his Argument.

Raphael Hollingshed's Silence is made another Evidence of the *Nag's Head* Consecration: But then his Silence proves more than *Stow's* doth, for he taketh no Notice even of Cardinal *Pole's* Consecration, so that if this be a Proof, it proves too much, even that we never had any Archbishop consecrated.

BUT the truth is *Stow* and *Hollingshed*, and other Civil Historians, have little regarded Consecrations, and such other particular Parts of Ecclesiastical History. And when they do say any thing of Church Affairs, it is only something General, and which has some dependance upon Civil Transactions, and therefore, he that draws such Conclusions from such Premises, must have

have a very strong Inclination to defend a Cause at any Rate.

WE are further told out of the Author of *The Nullity of the Protestant Clergy of England*, That one Father Faircloth being shew'd the Publick Registers by Archbishop Abbot, told the Archbishop, "that his Father was a Protestant and kept a Shop in *Cheapside*, and that he assur'd him that he was present at *Parker's* and the first Protestant Bishops Consecration at *the Nag's Head in Cheapside*." The Controversy of Ordination, p. 43.

I presume in a Hundred Years more, we shall have more Evidences of the same Nature brought against us, for here is a new Witness brought. At First *Neal* was the Man, and the only Man of that Party, as far as I can find, that was present; I suppose we shall have Affidavits of the Presence of other Witnesses, printed upon us e'er it be long. The Testimonies of *Rome* are endless, and no doubt of it they are as infallible in these as they are in their other Determinations in Controversy.

BUT the true History of this Matter is this; *Fitzherbet*, in a Book of his publish'd about the Year 1614. desired that some Learned Men of the Roman Catholick Party, might have the perusal of our Publick Registers, in order to be satisfied of their being authentick. This Request was soon comply'd with, and some *Romish*

Priests then in Prison, *Faircloth* being one, were sent for, and had the full perusal of those Records, in the Presence of several of our Bishops, viz.

the Bishops of *London, Durham, Ely, Bath and Wells, Lincoln, and Rochester*: For these are Men not to be trusted alone with such Things, because

MASON *Vindicia Eccles Anglicanae*, p. 415. &c.

they are as great Enemies to true Records, as they are Friends to those that are false, and probably without such Caution and Care as was then us'd they would have defaced them. I say they had a liberty to peruse them as much as they pleas'd, and own'd themselves satisfy'd of their being authentick, which Thing the Archbishop desired them to signify by a Letter to Father Fitzherbert, who was the Man that caus'd this Examination. If they afterwards repented of this Conviction, that is a Case of Conscience to be reconciled by some Roman Casuist, who will tell you very gravely; without blushing, that to tell a Lye, to advance the Catholick Religion, *alias* the Religion of Rome, is a Duty, and no Sin.

BUT as to the Business in Hand, there was not a word then spoken by Faircloth, of his Father's being present at the Nag's Head Consecration; nor did Champney, who at that Time raised some Objections against this Examination, say a word of any such Passage, between Faircloth and the Archbishop, which no doubt of it he would have done if there had been any truth in it; for he could say nothing so much to his purpose as this is. This was a Story afterwards invented by the Author of the *Nullity of the Protestant Clergy*, when Mr. Mason was dead, who was acquainted with this Affair, and gives us an History of it.

CHAP.



C H A P. VIII.

The Falshood of the Nag's Head Consecration farther Prov'd.

WHAT has been already said in the last Chapter, in Answer to Mr. *Ward*, is sufficient to prove the *Nag's Head* Consecration to be a mere Fable, invented, without any colour of Truth, in order to Nullify the Orders of the Church of *England*. But, that I may as much as possible take away all occasion for Scruples out of the Minds of honest Men, who labour under the Yoke of Popery, and who have been misled by these and the like Insinuations, I shall farther prove the Falshood of this Story, by such Arguments as did not naturally fall in with Mr. *Ward's* Objections.

THE first Thing I shall take notice of in this Case, is Errors in Chronology, which manifestly appear in the relation of this Fable; and this has

ever been a certain Sign among all Criticks, of the Falshood of any Fact. Dr.

Vide Champney, *apud* Mason. p. 346.

Champney, in his Book of the *Vocation of English Bishops*, fixeth the Date of this *Nag's Head* Consecration, sometime before the 9th of *September* 1559. which cannot be, because *Parker* and the rest could not be consecrated without a Commission from the Queen. Now *Parker's* Commission does not bear Date, till the Sixth of *December* following, be-

HEYLIN'S History of the Reformation p. 293.

sides his Election was not confirm'd by the Dean of the *Arches*, until the Ninth of the same Month, both which are undeniable Proofs that he could not be ordain'd before that Time. Besides there are fourteen more who are said to be consecrated at the same Place, and at the same Time,

MASONI Vin- dicit Ecclesie Anglicanae, p. 346.

HEYLIN'S Hist. p. 310.

which is as incredible as the former, because it appears that some of them were not so much as consecrated in the same Year: If this be not a certain undeniable Evidence of the Falshood of this Story, I know not what is.

ANOTHER very manifest Argument of the Falshood of this Story, is the profound Silence of all Popish Writers (a Generation not much inclin'd to Silence) during the whole Reign of Queen *Elizabeth*, and the beginning of King *James's* of any such ridiculous Consecration as this is. We do not find a word of it even in *Sander's* wild Book *De Schismate Anglicano*, although he has there Collected together all the Scandal that could well be invented of the Reformation, yet he is as mute as a Fish, with respect to this Matter, which No-body can suppose to be owing either to his Modesty or good will to us, for he had as little

of the one, as he had of the other; and therefore it is certain that this Story was the product of some other more modern *Genius* than his.

BESIDES him, there, are a great many others, as *Harding, Stapleton, Parsons*, and even *Kellison*, before his Reply to *Sutcliff*, were absolute Strangers to any such Account of our Consecrations as this is, which evidently appears by their Writings: I shall Instance only in *Kellison*, whom I take to be the inventor of this Story. Before this noble Project came into his Head, he argu'd against our Orders, because he thought our first Ordainers were Apostates and Hereticks, and because they did not use the Popish Ordinal, but not one word of the *Nag's Head*, or of Bishop *Scory's* Form there: His Words are these:

“ They will peradventure say, KELLISON'S
Survey of the
New Religion,
P. 6.
“ that their first Bishops, Priests and
“ Preachers, were ordained by ours,
“ before they departed from us, and
“ that they ordaining others, still continued the
“ Succession. But this Evasion is not sufficient;
“ for first of all, either our Pastors were Lawful or
“ Unlawful; if Lawful, then are theirs Unlaw-
“ ful; who Preached against the Commandment
“ of ours, yea, then are they Usurpers, who thrust
“ out their Lawful Pastors, and settled themselves
“ in their rooms. If Unlawful, then do they
“ absurdly Challenge Succession from them; be-
“ cause none can succeed Lawfully to Unlawful
“ Predecessors, if they have no other Title but
“ from them. Secondly, although some of their
“ Apostates were made Priests and Pastors by our
“ Bishops; yet all were not such, *Luther* and *Cal-*
“ *vin* the first Founders, and many others were
“ not Bishops, and so could not Ordain Priests
“ and Pastors, and they which were true Bishops
among

“ among them used not the Matter and Form of
 “ Ordination.—And if they had truly ordained
 “ their Ministers, as their Apostate Bishops might
 “ have done if they had used the Matter and Form
 “ of Order, because Power of Consecrating and
 “ Ordering, which Divines call *Potestas Ordinis*,
 “ is never abolished; yet besides Order, Juris-
 “ diction and Mission from a Lawful Pastor is also
 “ required, for as St. Paul saith, *Quomodo predi-*
 “ *cabunt, nisi mittantur?* How shall they Preach ex-
 “ cept they be sent? And seeing our Pastors were
 “ so far from sending them, that they forbade
 “ them all Pulpits, and Preaching, from them
 “ they could have no Mission: And so they can-
 “ not prove their ordinary Mission. Thus far
 Kellison.

Now here it is observable, that the manner of
 his Opposition runs thus; first, that it is not Law-
 ful to separate from Lawful Pastors. Secondly, If
 we say their Pastors were Unlawful, ours could
 not be Lawful, because deriving their Authority
 and Mission from them. Thirdly, That though
 our first Bishops were true Bishops, yet all were
 not such as *Luther* and *Calvin*; but then the Mis-
 sion of *Luther* and *Calvin* is nothing to us, for we
 do not pretend to prove any Mission from them.
 Fourthly, That our Bishops did not use the true
 Matter and Form of Ordination. Fifthly, That
 their Bishops gave them no Jurisdiction, but ra-
 ther oppos'd them.

But when Dr. *Sutcliff* set aside these Objections,
 by proving the Justice and Piety of our Separa-
 tion, and the Validity of our Forms and the
 Jurisdiction of our Bishops. Kellison being thus
 beaten out of his Holds, is forced to take Refuge
 under the Protection of a Lye, which is this of the
Nag's Head Fable. For in the Year 1608. he
 publish'd

publish'd a Reply to Dr. *Sutcliff*, wherein this Story had it first Life; nor was it ever heard of before this, notwithstanding there were so many very proper Occasions to mention it. You see *Kellison* himself takes no manner of Notice of it in his *Survey of the New Religion*, which was published in the Year 1605. though it was more to his purpose than all that he has there urg'd. If there had been any Truth in this Story it had certainly been produced before the Year 1608, which is almost Fifty Years after the Time when the thing was suppos'd to be done; especially since there is so much depends upon it, as the Validity of our whole Reformation: And we cannot suppose it to be conceal'd out of any favour or tenderness towards us; for indeed if it had been true, it had been no tenderness to the Souls of Men to have conceal'd it so long; and therefore we must conclude this Fable to be the Invention of a Man, press'd hard by an Adversary, who had nothing else to say for himself.

3. ANOTHER Argument, to prove this a Fiction, is the the Silence also of the Faction Puritans of that Age, who, no doubt of it, if there had been any thing of Truth in the *Nag's Head* Story, would soon have cast it in the Teeth of the Orthodox Bishops and Clergy, as the readiest and surest way to overturn the Apostolical Order of Bishops, which they were so much displeas'd with. This had been a ready Way to Silence all Arguments, if they could once shew, that the Episcopacy contended for by the Orthodox, was only *Nominal*, and not *Real*; but they were so far from urging any Argument of this Nature, that they call'd our Bishops Popish and Antichristian, because they had their Orders by Succession from the Popish Bishops.

I find a Manuscript Quotation to this purpose, in the Margin of the Preface to *Parson's Discussion*, which I have, and which I take to be written by a Papist; the words are taken out of a Book written by one *Prudent Ball*, a Nonconformist, which I never saw. The Words are these; Coverdale and Scory made Parker the first Archbishop of Canterbury, in Queen Elizabeth's Time, they received their Orders of Cranmer, and he of Pope Clement the VIIIth, who gave him Popish Antichristian Orders, vide *Prudent Ball*, the Second Part, C. II. p. 544. This shews how well pleas'd they were with our Orders upon the account of this Succession. But if any Body should think this Quotation not so well Attested as it ought to be; I refer him to

Vide BANCROFT'S
Dangerous Posi-
tions, &c. p. 49.

Bancroft's Dangerous Positions, &c. where he will find much of the Humour of that Set of Men in this, as well as in other Instances, taken out of their own Writings; and will any Body say, that if these Men had known any thing of this Story, that they would not have produced it; and instead of hard Words they would have produced one hard Argument, especially when it was such, as was just upon the level with their own Capacities.

BUT it is evident, by the Books then written in Defence of Episcopacy by Bishop *Bilson*, *Hooker*, *Saravia*, and others, that the Subject of the then Debate was the Divine Right of Episcopacy, and can any Body think that those empty Wretches would not have been glad to rid themselves of such an untoward Subject, if they could so easily have taken away the ground of the Debate, by saying, that though Episcopacy were of Divine Right, yet that their Adversaries could pretend to no such Right, because they wanted

Consecra-

Consecration, or at least that they were forced to be contented with a ridiculous one, which was rather worse than none.

4. THE Publick Manner of this ludicrous Consecration is another plain Argument against the Truth of it; for if they were put to such Shifts, as is pretended, they would have chose some other more Private Place than a Tavern to have acted it in, at least they would never have permitted a known Enemy to be there, as *Neal* was, to Report the same to the World, and so to make themselves a laughing Stock to Friends and Foes.

5. THERE was no Necessity for such a proceeding as this is, because they neither wanted an Ordinal, nor a competent Number of Bishops of the Protestant Religion to use it, nor yet a Church to go to, to perform this Ordinance in. For in the first Place there was an Ordinal ever since King *Edward's* Time, and which was establish'd by the Act of Uniformity in the first Year of this Queen, notwithstanding *Bonner's* Quibble to the contrary, in order to save his Bacon, and which *Scory* and *Coverdale* two of King *Edward's* Bishops, were themselves consecrated by, and therefore there was no deficiency upon the account of an Ordinal, which was of Protestant Extraction. 2. There was a sufficient number of Protestant Bishops then alive, there were no less than four, viz. *Barlow*, *Hodgskin*, *Coverdale* and *Scory*. For *Barlow* did not dye till about the Year 1570. which was Ten Years after this Consecration: For *Curtis* his Successor in the See of *Chichester*, was consecrated May 20. 1570. Secondly, *Hodgskins* was then alive, because we find the Queen Nominated him for one of the Consecrators in her Letters Patents, and

GODWIN de
Prælatibus
Angl. p. 562.

See MASON,
p. 126.

certainly

certainly she would not have named a Person that was then dead. Thirdly, and as to *Coverdale*, we have not only the Queen's Letters Patents, to testify his being then alive; but also Bishop *Godwyn*, in his Catalogue of the Bishops of *Exeter*, takes Notice of his return from Banishment, after the *Marian Persecution*. *Elizabetha reg-*

GODWYN ubi
Supra. p. 476. *num adepta, in patriam quidem rever-*
sus est; sedem vero relictam repetere
non curavit. Londini grandævus decessit, & in Pa-
rchiali Ecclesia S. Bartholomæi, Sepultura est traditus.

"*Elizabeth* coming to the Crown, he returned to
"his Country, but having left his See he did not
"care to be restor'd. He dy'd very old at
"London, and he lies Buried in the Parish-
"Church of *St. Bartholomew*. 4. *Scory* lived
till the beginning of the Year 1585.

GODWYN,
p. 546. which was Twenty-five Years after
this Consecration; so that you see
here are Bishops enough to perform this Office,
without being oblig'd to Popish Bishops for a Con-
secration; not to say any thing of *Bale* Bishop of
Ossory, or the Suffragan of *Thetford*, who were also
nam'd in the Queen's *Mandate* for the Consecra-
tion. Lastly, That there were Churches enough,
whose Doors must fly open to such a Consecration,
will, I believe, hardly be disputed by any Body
of common Sense, who considereth that the Laws
and Government were at that Time on the side of
the Reformation: So that weighing all these
Things according to the common Laws of Reason,
there could be no manner of Necessity, but on the
contrary, it would have been the height of Folly
and Madness, to act such a Part as the *Nag's*
Head Consecration is describ'd to be.

6. THERE is not one sufficient Witness pro-
duced to attest this Matter of Fact, and without
such

such a Witness, no Fact can be prov'd; one Witness indeed they pretend to have, but he is such a Witness, as impartial Men must own to be very incompetent; for it does not appear that he ever testified it upon Oath, or before a publick Notary, as a Witness ought to do; so far from this, that he was never produced to have affirm'd it before any Person of impartiality. Nor do I believe, that this pretended Witness Mr. *Neal* ever said it at all, because if he had told any Body this, he must have told it to *Bonner*, who is said to have sent him to the *Nag's Head* to see, and to give an Account to his Master what was done: But it plainly appears by Bishop *Bonner's* Case before-mentioned, that he never told him one word of it, otherwise he would have urg'd this in his Plea, and consequently we may reasonably conclude, that this Mr. *Neal* never said it, and therefore they have not so much as one Witness to Attest this Fact.

To Number up all the Improbabilities and Inconsistencies of this ridiculous Story were endless; it has not so much as one Mark of Truth belonging to it. It is neither attested by sufficient Witnesses, who liv'd in the Time when it was suppos'd to be done, nor is it founded upon any probable Circumstances, peculiar to that Age, nor upon any Record whatsoever, but on the contrary it evidently appears to be invented to serve the turn of a contemptible Faction, who had nothing else to say for themselves.

I shall conclude this Chapter with the Account which Dr. *Heylin* giveth of our first Consecrators in Opposition to this Fable: And this is an Historian which the *Romanists* themselves often express an esteem for, not that he is to be regarded the more for that Reason, but because he really is in himself such a Man as *Tully* describes a good Historian to be.

be. *Ne quid falsi dicere audeat, ne quid veri non audeat.*

“ **BUT** to proceed (says Heylin)
 History of the Reformation, P. 293. “ unto the Consecration of the new
 “ Archbishop; the first Thing to be
 “ done after the passing the Royal
 “ Assent for Ratifying of the Election of the Dean
 “ and Chapter, was the confirming of it in the
 “ Court of *Arches*, according to the usual Form
 “ in that behalf; which being accordingly per-
 “ formed, the Vicar-General, the Dean of the
 “ *Arches*, the Proctors and Officers of the Court,
 “ whose Presence was required at this Solemnity,
 “ were entertained at a Dinner provided for them,
 “ at the *Nag's Head Tavern* in *Cheapside*; for which
 “ though *Parker* paid the Shot, yet shall the
 “ Church be called to an after-reckoning. No-
 “ thing remains to expedite the Consecration, but
 “ the Royal *Mandate*, which I find Dated on the
 “ Sixth of *December*, directed to *Anthony Kitchin*,
 “ Bishop of *Landaff*; *William Barlow*, late Bishop
 “ of *Bath and Wells*, Lord elect of *Chichester*; *John*
 “ *Scory* late Bishop of *Chichester*, Lord elect of
 “ *Hereford*; *Miles Coverdale*, late Bishop of *Ex-*
 “ *ter*; *John Hodgkins* Suffragan of *Bedford*;
 “ *John* — Suffragan of *Thetford*; and *John*
 “ *Bale*, Bishop of *Offory*, in the Realm of *Ireland*,
 “ requiring them, or any four of them at the least,
 “ to proceed unto the Consecration of the Right
 “ Reverend *Matthew Parker*, lately elected to the
 “ Metropolitcal See of *Canterbury*. The first, and
 “ the two last, either hinder'd by Sickness, or by
 “ some other lawful Impediment, were not in a
 “ Condition to attend the Service; which not-
 “ withstanding was performed by the other four,
 “ on Sunday the seventeenth of that Month, ac-
 “ cording to the Ordinal of King *Edward* the
 “ Sixth,

" Sixth, then newly printed for that Purpose;
 " the Ceremony performed in the Chapel at *Lambeth-House*, the East End whereof was hanged
 " with rich Tapestry, and the Floor covered with
 " red Cloth; the Morning Service read by *Pearson* the Archbishop's Chaplain, the Sermon
 " preach'd by Dr. *Scory* Lord elect of *Hereford*,
 " on those Words of St. *Peter*, *The Elders which*
 " *are among you I exhort, &c.* 1 Pet. v. i. The
 " Letters Patents for proceeding to the Consecra-
 " tion publickly read by Dr. *Tale*, the Act of
 " Consecration, legally performed by the Im-
 " position of Hands of the said four Bishops, ac-
 " cording to the ancient Canons, and King *Edward's*
 " Ordinal; and after all a Plentiful Din-
 " ner for the Entertainment of the Company
 " which resorted thither: Among whom *Charles*
 " *Howard* (eldest Son of *William* Lord *Effingham*,
 " created afterwards Lord Admiral, and Earl of
 " *Nottingham*) happened to be one, and after-
 " wards testified the Truth of all these Particulars,
 " when the reality and Form of this Consecration
 " was called in Question by some captious Stick-
 " lers for the Church of *Rome*.

" F O R so it was, that some Sticklers for the
 " Church of *Rome*, having been told of the Dinner
 " which was made at the *Nag's Head* Tavern, at
 " such Times as the Election of the new Arch-
 " bishop was Confirmed in the *Arches*, raised a
 " Report that the *Nag's Head* Tavern was the Place
 " of Consecration. And this Report was counte-
 " nanced by another Slander, causing it to be
 " noised abroad, and published in some Seditious
 " Pamphlets, that the Persons designed by the
 " Queen, for the several Bishopricks, being met at
 " a Tavern, did then and there lay Hands upon
 " one another without Form or Order.

Now

Now I appeal even to a prejudiced Reader, that has not lost his Senses, which of these two Accounts looks most like a true History; whether their Fable of the *Nag's Head*, which has so many Inconsistencies in it, and is founded upon no Evidence; or this Account which Dr. *Heylin* giveth of *Parker's* Consecration, the Facts which he relates are founded upon what ought to be the Foundation of all History, viz. publick Records; but their Story has no such Foundation, it is all hear-say work, which was never before reputed a competent Testimony to assert a Matter Fact. I have now done with it, and let it rest in the same Pit of Oblivion, with the first authors of it.





C H A P. IX.

*That the Lambeth Registers are
Genuine.*

HAVING already so evidently prov'd the *Nag's Head* Story to be Spurious, upon such undeniable Grounds; there is no need for any further Proof, that the *Lambeth* Register of *Parker's* Consecration is Genuine, because the Opposition rais'd against them is purely to support the Credit of this Fable; but lest Mr. *Ward's* surviving Friends should think that any Reasons brought by him, however contemptible they be, to prove them Spurious, are overlook'd as unanswerable, I shall, for the sake of their Conviction, take upon me the Drudgery of a particular Examination of what he has said.

H

MR.

Mr. *Ward* introduceth his Opposition with a Passage out of Mr. *Mason*, which relates to the manner of Archbishop *Parker's* Consecration, which is this; "Now the See of

The Controversy of Ordination, P. 45.

"*Canterbury* continu'd void till December following, (*Anno* 1559.) about which Time the Dean and

"Chapter having receiv'd the *Conge d'Esire*, Elected Mr. Dr. *Parker* for their Archbishop, according to the ancient manner, and laudable Custom of the said Church anciently us'd, and inviolably observ'd. After which Election orderly perform'd, and signify'd according to Law, it pleas'd her Highness to send her Letters Patents of Commission, for his Confirmation and Consecration, to seven Bishops, six whereof were lately returned from Exile. *Anthony Landaff*, *William Barlow*, *John Scory*, *Miles Coverdale*, *John Suffragan* of *Bedford*, *John Suffragan* of *Thetford*, and *John Bale* Bishop of *Offory*. (And then says he) to take away all Scruple, I will faithfully deliver unto you out of Authentical Records, both the Day when he was consecrated, and the Persons by whom, viz.

Anno 1559. M. *Parker*, Cant. cons. 17. December, by

} *William Barlow*,
 } *John Scory*,
 } *Miles Coverdale*,
 } *John Hodgkins*.

THUS Mr. *Mason* relates the Matter, and the first thing Mr. *Ward* observes, from this Relation to the prejudice of the *Lambeth Register* is, that they say, "*Matthew Parker* was Ibid, Pag. 46. "Elected by *Conge d'Esire*, this is "such a Flaw in them, as cannot be imagined to have

" have happened in an authentick and genuine
 " Register, which in the Relation of the Matter
 " of Fact, cannot but Record it as it was actual-
 " ly done: At that Time there was no such thing
 " in use as a *Conge d' Eslire*; it being contrary,
 " not only to the King and Queen's Supremacy,
 " but also to the Statutes and Laws of the Land
 " then in Force.

Mr. *Ward* goeth on to prove by Acts of Parlia-
 ment, that the *Conge d' Eslire* Writ was abolished,
 whereas this is what no Man living, that under-
 stands this Matter, will deny him. But as to the
 Flaw which Mr. *Ward* speaks of, that will be
 found in Mr. *Ward's* Understanding, and not in
 the Register; for the Register has
 not one word of the *Conge d' Eslire* in
 it; if Mr. *Ward* had examined the
 Record, that would have told him
 otherwise, but some Men love to
 write upon a Subject they know no-
 thing of. Indeed Mr. *Mason* speaks of a *Conge d'*
Eslire, but I hope his Writings are no Records,
 he calls the Writ for Election by that Name in
 compliance with the Vulgar way of speaking,
 and that Form of Speech has continu'd to this
 Day; for we find nothing more common of this
 Nature than to hear of a *Conge d' Eslire*, even in
 our Days, directed to a Dean and Chapter to
 choose a new Bishop: How to correct this popular
 Error I leave to Mr. *Ward's* surviving Friends to
 find out an expedient for it, and farther, they
 shall have all the little Interest I am Master of,
 in order to obtain a Patent for the sole Property,
 in the honour of accomplishing so great an Un-
 dertaking.

See the Re-
 cord i- self in
 the Appendix
 to *Bramhall's*
 Works.

" A second Flaw in the Record, is
 " saying, that the Dean and Chap-

Ibid. Pag. 47.

“ter did chuse Mr. Dr. Parker, *juxta morem anti-*
 “*quum*, &c. according to the ancient Manner, and
 “laudable Custom of the said Church, anciently
 “us’d, and inviolably observ’d: For this could
 “not be, because the ancient Custom of that
 “and other such Churches, was to have free
 “Election by *Conge d’ Eslire*.

THIS again is another Flaw, not to be found
 in the Record, there are no such Words as *juxta*
 Numb. III. *morem antiquum*, &c. in the Record
 itself, if considered separately from
 the Queen’s Letters Patents, so that the Flaw is in
 Mr. Ward, for blindly following a Mistake in Mr.
 Mason’s first Edition of his Book of *English Bishops*,
 where he quotes the *Lambeth Register*, for what he
 says, instead of the Queen’s Letter *Missive*, or
 Writ to the Dean and Chapter. This Error he has
 taken care to correct in his *Latin* Edition,
 published in the Year 1625. which Edition, being
 more augmented, and more correct than the for-
 mer, ought to be the Standard for References in
 this Controversy.

BUT though this doth not affect the *Lambeth*
Register, yet it may be wonder’d how the Letter
Missive comes to assert, that Parker was Elected
juxta morem antiquum, after the ancient Manner,
 whereas the *Conge d’ Eslire* was then abolish’d. The
 Reader must here observe, that the Queen’s Let-
 ter refers to the ancient Manner of Election,
 and not to the old Writ of *Conge d’ Eslire*, which is
 no part of the Election, but only a *Mandate* to
 Elect one Man for a Bishop out of two or three
 therein-nominated, and the only difference between
 the Letter *Missive* and the old *Conge d’ Eslire* is this,
 that the first Names but one, and the latter named
 more than one, the old Ceremony of choosing
 continues to this Day, and this is all that is meant
 by

by *juxta morem antiquum & laudabilem consue-
ndi-
nem Ecclesiæ prædictæ*, &c. in the Queen's Writ
to the Dean and Chapter for the Election of Dr.
Parker, to the Archbishoprick of *Canterbury*;
which Form of Words continue to be us'd in all
those Writs to this very Day.

Another Objection against this Re-
gister (which a Man must have some
patience to answer) is this, "That

The Contro-
versy of Odi-
nation, P. 48.

"the Election of *Matthew Parker*, in
"the Register, agrees not in Time with his being
"called Bishop Elect by *John Stow*, and *Raphael*
"Hollingshed in their Chronicles. For they speak-
"ing of the Solemnity of the *French King*, *Henry*
"II. kept at *St. Paul's Church* in *London*, on the
"Eighth and Ninth Days of *September*, stile *Mat-*
"thew *Parker*, at that Time Dr. *Parker*, Arch-
"bishop of *Canterbury* Elect, which is near three
"Months before *Mason* Elects him in his Register;
"and farther we find, Dr. *Grindal* call'd by *Hol-*
"lingshed, Bishop newly Elect on the 12th of *Aug-*
"ust, and we may reasonably conclude *Parker*
"elected before him, this, says he, is four
"Months before *Mason's* Election of him, by his
"pretended *Conge d'Esire*. But which is yet
"more, Dr. *Heylin* tells us, That Doctor *Matthew*
"Parker, was elected to the See of *Canterbury*,
"on the first of *August*. The *Conge d'Esire*,
"says he, which opened him the way to this eminent
"Dignity, bears date on the 8th of *July*, within a
"few Days after the Deprivation of the former
"Bishops.

THIS Man certainly either knew not what he
was about, or else he thought to amuse Some-
body, very ignorant, with this for an Argument.
He seems to me to confound the Time of *Parker's*
Election, and the Time of his Consecration, and

then he is so weak as to bring a Passage out of *Heylin* to confound himself, for it is to no other Purpose that I know of. *Heylin* says, that *Parker* was elected *August* the first, if so, he was elected above a Month before the Solemnities of *Henry* the Second, mention'd by *Stow* and *Hollingshed*; both *Mason* and *Heylin* agree with the Register, in the Time of his Consecration, which was *December* the seventeenth; this indeed was three Months after the Solemnities, but then you see, that he was elected before, and consequently might be called Bishop Elect at that Time: The same may be said as to *Grindal*, and if I were to prove his Election, I would bring in *Stow* and *Hollingshed*, to prove that he was elected before the twelfth of *August*, and consequently long enough before *Henry* the II^d's Solemnities, to be called Bishop Elect at those Solemnities. But I would be glad to know what all this is, to the *Lambeth* Register, and how it affects the veracity of it; for this is a Record of their Consecrations, and not of their Elections; Election is always suppos'd to go before Consecration.

BUT perhaps this Writer means, that when a Bishop is call'd a Bishop Elect, he is supposed to be consecrated too; but this is contrary to common Practice, for there is nothing more common than to call a Bishop after his Election, Bishop Elect of such a Place, and sometimes Bishop absolutely, though he has not been yet consecrated; this is what any old Woman almost would have told him, that walks the Streets: So that this is very far from having any influence upon the *Lambeth* Register, it being indeed to the last degree trifling.

Hrs

HIS next pretended Argument is drawn from two of the Queen's Commissions, which he has found in Archbishop *Bramhall's* Book, for the Consecration of *Parker*. The first Commission is dated *September* the ninth, 1559. directed to six Bishops, *Cuthbert* Bishop of *Durham*; *Gilbert* Bishop of *Bath*; *David* Bishop of *Peterborough*; *Anthony* Bishop of *Landaff*; *William Barlow* Bishop, and *John Scory*. The second Commission is dated *December* the sixth following, this last directed to *Anthony Landaff*, *William Barlow*, *John Scory*, *Miles Coverdale*, *John Suffragan* of *Bedford*, and *John Suffragan* of *Thetford*, *John Bale* Bishop of *Offory*.

The Contraven-
tion of Odi-
nation, p. 49, 50,
&c.

THE first Commission is, it seems, according to him, a great blemish upon the Records, because it is directed to three Catholick Bishops, viz. the Bishops of *Durham*, *Bath*, and *Peterborough*, the Reason is, because they were deprived. Now I think this to be the Reason, why this first Commission was not executed, because when it came to be considered, that it would be illegal to Authorize illegal Bishops, to act after their Deprivation; or else perhaps it was afterwards thought, that those three Bishops would not comply, without force, with the Commission; or it may be as Bishop *Bramhall* says, "that it was dropt because
" it wanted an *et ut minus*, or any four of you,
" so that if any of the six were Sick, or Absent,
" or refus'd, the rest could not proceed to Consecrate; which they certainly could not according to this first Mandate. But whether all or any of these Reasons was the Cause why this Commission was dropt I know not, yet am I equally ignorant, how this first Commission can affect the *Lambeth* Register, they having no Relation one

with the other, for one is kept at the *Rolls*, the other at *Lambeth*, two different Offices. The *Lambeth* Register indeed refers to the Second Commission which is that which was executed, and it would be strange if it did not.

IF they say, that both these Instruments are forged, let them prove it, they may as well say, that all our Records are forg'd as well as these, but saying and proving are two Things: The first the Romanists are very well acquainted with; but to the latter they are the greatest Straugers in the World. But there is one Circumstance attending these Commissions, that has as little of the Marks of a Forgery as any I know of; and that is, that there should be two, for those Men must be very fond of forging Instruments, that will be at the trouble of forging two, when one is sufficient.

BUT it seems the terrible Consequence of this first Commission is this, "that it is dated September the ninth, which shews, that Dr. Parker was elected before that Time, so that by this, his Election must be full three Months before Mr. Mason speaks him elected. But Mr. Ward's Misfortune here seems to me to be, that he has not consulted Mr. Mason upon this Subject; For Mr. Mason tells us, that the Writ, to the Dean and Chapter for his Election, is dated July 18. 1559. and that he was chosen accordingly, August the first, in the same Year. Mr. Mason's Words are these, *Porro Ecclesia Cantuariensis, à morte Poli, per Annum integrum & tres circiter Septimanas, pastoralis Solatio est viduata. Interim Decanus & capitulum, eligendi facultate accepta, juxta morem antiquum & laudabilem consuetudinem Ecclesie predictae ab antiquo usitatam & inconcussè observatam*

Vindiciæ Ecclesie Anglicanæ, Page 359.

Dat. 18. July 1559.

statam procedentes, *Matthæum Parkerum, Sacra Theologia Doctorem, in Archiepiscopum elegerunt.* " Moreover the Church
 " of Canterbury, from the Death of *Pool*, for one
 " whole Year, and about three Weeks was desti-
 " tute of a Pastor. In the mean while the Dean
 " and Chapter having received a Dat. 18. July
 " Licence for electing, according to 1559.
 " the ancient Manner, and laudable
 " Custom of the said Church, anciently us'd, and
 " inviolably observ'd, they chose *Matthew Par-*
 " *ker*, Doctor in Divinity, to be 1 Aug. 1559.
 " Archbishop.

HERE we see what Mr. *Mason* says, we find the Archbishop chosen on the 1st of *August*, before the Date of this Commission; which Mr. *Ward* doth mention. But I believe it was Mr. *Mason's* *English* imperfect Edition of this Book, published in the Year 1613. that led Mr. *Ward* into this Mistake; for in that Edition Mr. *Mason's* Words are general, without any Reference in the Margin to the particular Time when *Parker's* Election happened; and perhaps Mr. *Mason* had not then consulted the Records relating to his Election: For his words are general, about that Time, viz. *December*, the Dean and Chapter having received the Conge d' Eslire, elected MASON'S English Edition, p. 126.
Master Doctor Parker for their Arch-
bishop. But how Mr. *Ward* comes to confine these general Words to his own Time; I know not, at least how to excuse him, or any Writer, for not examining into the bottom of a Subject he undertaketh to write of, is what I know less how to do.

MR. *Ward* goes on to say abundance of fine Things of these three Pag. 51.
 Bishops, that they were zealous Catholics, they
 would

would not Consecrate without the Pope's Authority, that they would not use King *Edward's* Ordinal, because they had condemn'd it in Queen *Mary's* Days, and abundance more such stuff as this, which is nothing at all to the Business in hand, which is the validity of the *Lambeth* Register; he might as well have said that the Archbishop of *Toledo* was never consecrated, because it doth not appear that the Archbishop of *Paris* ever consecrated him, as to argue against the *Lambeth* Register, from such premises.

Equally insufficient is what he says, of the Queen's not thinking *Barlow*, *Scory*, *Coverdale*, &c. true Bishops, because she directed her first Commission to three of those which he has dignified with the Title of Catholick Bishops, whereas this very Commission itself shews the contrary, because *Barlow* and *Scory* are both named in it, as well as the other three, and as for *Coverdale*, *Hodgkins*, and the rest, who are nominated in the room of these three in the Second Commission, she had the same Reason to think them true Bishops as she had to think *Barlow* and *Scory* to be such. But if neither had been named, to conclude from thence that Queen *Elizabeth* did not think them good Bishops upon that account, is the same as to conclude, that if there were a Commission now directed to the Bishops of *London*, *Winchester*, *Durham* and *Ely*, to Consecrate a new Bishop, and that because the Bishop of *Rochester*, or *St. David's* or any of the rest of our Bishops, are not named in such a Commission; that for this reason the present Government did not repute these true Bishops; this I think is to conclude very wildly. Surely our Princes have a liberty to name who they please in their Commissions, without consulting the captious; but such Conclusions we may expect

expect from those whose principal Talents are Ignorance or Insincerity.

ANOTHER Argument against this Register, is this, " That the Time of Parker's

" Consecration in the Register,

The Controversy
of Ordination,
p. 61.

" which is *December* the seven-

" teenth, differs a Month, and per-

" haps more, from the Time that *Raphael Holling-*

" *shed* takes him for a Bishop in the Chronicle,

" which is *November* the eighteenth; and I be-

" lieve few doubt, but as much Credit is to be

" given to that Historian, as to the *Lambeth Re-*

" cords, all Things considered. He speaking of

" *Tunstall* Bishop of *Durham* says, *He was by the*

noble Queen Elizabeth depriv'd of his Bishoprick,

&c. and was committed to *Matthew Parker* Bishop of

Canterbury, who us'd him very honourably, both for

the Gravity, Learning and Age of the said *Tunstall*;

but he not long remaining under the Ward of the said

Bishop did shortly after, the 18th of *November*, de-

part, this Life at *Lambeth*, where he first receiv'd

his Consecration. " Thus writes *Hollingshed*.

" FROM which it is manifest, that *Parker*

" was consecrated Bishop (such Consecration as it

" was) before the eighteenth Day of *November*;

" for else he could not have stiled him Bishop of

" *Canterbury*, and have placed him in the Bishop's

" Palace at *Lambeth*, and all this before the Death

" of his Prisoner, who died *November* the eigh-

" teenth.

MR. Ward is very unfortunate in the choice of

his Proofs against this Register; for here is another

Record besides, that looks *Mr. Ward* (or his

Friends, if he is dead) full in the Face, and

that is the Letters Patents which are dated the

six of *December*; now he could not be consecra-

ted before this *Mandate*, without running himself

: and

and his Consecrators into the Guilt of a *Præsumptio*; so that we find *Parker*, was not consecrated before the eighteenth of *September*; notwithstanding that *Hollingshed* calleth him a Bishop before that Time. There are a number of other Records to be refer'd to, upon this occasion, if so trifling an Objection deserv'd so much trouble; for what is there more common, than to call a Man Bishop when he is Elected, and publickly designed to be consecrated to that Office. But it seems in Mr. *Ward's* Eye that *Hollingshed* deserves more Credit than all our Publick Records, Civil as well as Ecclesiastical, which all conspire in the Proof of *Parker's* not being consecrated till *December*. I have often heard that the exactness and fidelity of private Historians, have been try'd by Records; but I never heard before that Records were to be try'd by private Historians. Not that I charge *Hollingshed* with any unfaithfulness in this Case, for he only uses the common Modes of Speech, of calling a Man a Bishop when he is elected into that Office; I only shew the unreasonableness of these Inferences, which distracted Brains put upon Words that will not bear it.

Equally weak is his next Objection out of old *Stow*, relating to *Grindal* Bishop of *London*, because *Stow* calls him Bishop absolutely at the Celebration of the *French* King's Obsequies in *September*, 1559.

Controversy of
Ordination,
P. 62. &c.

" whereas it is plain that he calls
" *Parker* and others, Bishops Elect only, who ac-
" cording to them were consecrated at the same
" Time, and this pretended Consecration of theirs
" too was after this *September* mentioned in the
Objection.

BUT however lest his Friends should think
I despise his Objections too much, I shall
abridge

abridge this Objection in the strongest Terms I can.

"Grindall according to *Mason's Register*, was consecrated the 21st of *December* 1559. but *Stow* calls *Grindall* Bishop of *London* on the ninth of *September* in the same Year; therefore the *Lambeth Register* must be false, because *Grindall* was above three Months before consecrated according to *Stow* that faithful Historian.

THIS I take to be the Strength of his Argument.

Now for Argument sake, I will give up this Consecration on the 21st of *December*, and will grant that he was consecrated before. But where? at the *Nag's Head*. When? Dr. *Champney* will tell you it was in the beginning of *November*, but then here we are at a loss again; for *November* is after *September*, as well as our *December* is. So that by this, *Grindall* must be consecrated thrice; by *John Stow*, before the ninth of *September*; by *Neal*, *Champney* and *Ward* at the *Nag's Head* in the beginning of *November*; and lastly, by our Register in *December*.

Vide Champney, in *MASON'S* *Vindiciae Ecclesiae Anglicanae*, P. 346.

Spectatum admissi Risum teneatis amici?
away with such Trifles.

"His seventh Objection against the *Lambeth Register*, arises from the different Names of that pretended Suffragan *Hodskins*: Sometimes he is called *John Suffragan* of *Bedford*, sometimes *Richard Suffragan* of the same Place; in one Place *Richard* is put out, and *John* put in; Dr. *Butler* calls him *John Suffragan* of *Dover*, and *Sutcliff* says, there were

Page 65.

"were two Suffragans; the Queen's Commission mentions also two, *John Suffragan of Bedford*, and *John Suffragan of Thetford*.

NOW I would fain know, how these Mistakes affect this Record; these People that he mentions, as thus mistaking the Names, are very different from the Record; and shall the blunder of a Transcriber have such an effect as to destroy the Original. This I am sure is somewhat new. The Truth of what any Man writes, from any Record, is to be determined by that Record. If what he has Transcribed is false, that is not to be imputed to the Record, but to the Transcriber. This is the common Practice of the World, but it seems it is not the Practice of *Ward* and his Friends, nor is it worth my while to persuade them to act otherwise.

Ibid.

THE Eighth Objection is, "That there is no Coherence between *Matson's Lambeth* Records, and those *Mr. Goodwin*, uses in his Catalogue of Bishops. For they differ sometimes in the Day, sometimes in the Month, and sometimes in the Year, as appears in the pretended Consecrations of *Grindall*, *Horn*, *Gueast*, *Piers*, and others.

THIS is a formidable Argument, I own, and it must unavoidably destroy the Credit of this *Lambeth* Register. But, as far as I can see, there is but one Misfortune that attends it, and that is, that there is not a word of Truth in this whole Relation; and what a pity it is, that so fine an Argument should be spoil'd, only for the want of so simple an Ingredient as this is.

I will put the Proof of this, upon the issue of an Examination, into the Coherency between these two Writers, in their Accounts of the Consecrations of those four Bishops, which he has brought as Instances

stances of this Disagreement, viz. *Horn, Grindall, Gueast and Piers.*

Mr. *Mason* gives us this Account of the Consecration of Bishop *Horn*, *Robertus Horn, cons. 1560. 16. Februarii a Matth. Cantuar. Tho. Menev. Edm. London. Tho. Covent. & Litchf.*

MASON *Vindictæ Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ*, p. 385.

Bishop *Godwyn* gives this Account of it, *Februarij 16. 1560. Robertus Horn in Episcopum Wintoniensem consecratus est*: In both you see he was consecrated the 16. of *February*, 1560. Bishop *Grindall*, according to *Mason*, was consecrated the 21. of *December*, 1559, and so we find him in Bishop *Godwyn*. *Gueast* in *Mason* is consecrated the 24. of *March*, 1559. and he is the same in *Godwyn*. Lastly, *Piers* in *Mason*, was consecrated *April* the 15. 1576. the same in Bishop *Godwyn*.

GODWYN & *Præulibus Angl.* p. 300.

MASON, p. 384.

GODWYN p. 253.

MASON, p. 388.

GODWYN, p. 383.

MASON, p. 383. GODWYN, ib.

ALL that I conclude from this Examination is, that Mr. *Ward*, if he is dead, was when alive, a true trusty Member of the Church of *Rome*, and knew how to defend his Church, and oppose her Adversaries as well as the best *Jesuit* of them all, and let any of his surviving Friends deny me this if they can.

“ WE are come at last to discover
“ many insignificant and ridiculous
“ Circumstances in these Records,
“ such as become not the Gravity
“ of such a Relation, and consequently quite de-
“ stroy the Credit of these Records” with a Man
of Judgment as Mr. *Ward* was.

The Controversy of Ordination, Page 66.

BUT

Ibid. BUT what are these ridiculous Circumstances? why they are " 1. " A Sermon, and a Communion. 2. A Concourse " of People. 3. The Queen sent to see if all " things were rightly performed. 4. Answer " was brought her that nothing was amiss, only " *Miles Coverdale*, could not be prevail'd with to " vest himself in any Canonical Ornaments, but " had on only his Side Woollen Gown all the " Time of the Consecration. 5. That the Law- " yers assured the Queen, that this Gown of his " could not cause any defect in the Consecration. " Sixthly, The Chappel was adorn'd with " Tapestry towards the East End, and a Red " Cloth on the Floor.

Now all these Circumstances, excepting the first and the last are false, and not to be met with in the Record, as the Reader may see, if he consults the Register. Indeed *Miles Coverdale's* Habit is taken notice of, and no wonder because it was singular, and indeed so are the Habits of all the Rest; but not a word of the Lawyers bringing the Queen Word, that this was no defect. It is neither the adorning of the Chappel, the Sermon, nor several other Circumstances of this Nature, can affect these Records, because every Body knows that those *punctilio's*, in such publick Transactions as this was, are in other Registers, as well as in this; but it is what this fly Forgerer himself has brought in, that maketh these Records look contemptible, viz. That the Queen sent to see if Things were rightly performed, and *secundum artem* as he calls it, as if she had been suspicious of the Capacities of the Bishops to know when they did right, or when they did wrong: That she sent her Lawyers there

to this purpose. Not one word of this in all the Record. So that here we have again more Forgeries; a Record forg'd for us, by Mr. *Ward*, or some of his Kidney: So that all his Arguments, which he has spun out, into a very fine length, which are founded upon this Forgery of theirs, are not to be taken Notice of by me, in a Vindication of the *Lambeth Register*; for there are no such Premises in that Register, to draw such Conclusions from, as the Reader may see with his own Eyes; therefore let us farther see what he has to say next against this Record.

“T H E R E are besides these, several other Considerations, which not a little lessen the Credit of the *Lambeth Register*, especially this, that it was never seen, nor so much as spoken of before fifty Years after that pretended *Lambeth* Consecration.

Controversy of
Ordination, p.
68.

H E R E we find the Tables turned upon us; we have often urged the Falseness of the *Nag's Head* Fable, because it was no sooner produced, and now they bring the same Argument against us, but how justly any Body may determine, who considers that when Records are produced, there is something said by the adverse Party, that maketh such a Testimony necessary; but if nothing of that Nature happens, to produce Records would be trifling and insignificant: For there was nothing said by the Popish Writers, in all Queen *Elizabeth's* Reign, that could make their Testimony necessary. The Controversy then turned upon the Legality of our Ordinations; the Fact of the Consecration was never disputed, and no ludicrous *Nag's Head* Business ever thought on; yet

Viz. By *Mason*,
Heylin, *Bram-*
hall, &c.

no sooner was this Fable urg'd, but out came the Records, and it was time enough then; for until they came to invent a false Consecration upon us, where was the Necessity of producing the Register of the true?

BUT were these Registers never talk'd of, till Fifty Years afterwards? Here again Mr. *Ward* is out in his History, for all the Lords and Commons of *England*, very publickly refer to them, in an Act of Parliament, within seven Years after the Time of the Consecrations, which they are Registers of: For upon a Dispute whether King *Edward's* Ordinal was sufficiently established by Law, by the Act of the 1 of *Elix.* the Parliament, in her Eighth Year, took this into Consideration, and declared by another Act of that

See the Appendix, Num. 2.

Session, that this Form was Lawful, and sufficiently established; in which Act, among other Things, there are these Words, which do plainly refer to these Registers, viz.

KEBLE'S Stat. p. 816.

"THAT every thing Requisite
"and Material hath been made
"and done as precisely, and with
"as great Care and Diligence, or rather
"more, as ever the like was done before her
"Majesty's Time, as the Records of her Majesty's
"said Father and Brother's Time, and also of her
"own Time, will more plainly testify and de-
"clare.

HERE you see a very publick Testimony given to these Records, within seven Years after the Consecration. Again,

Archbishop *Parker* himself publish'd, an account of the Consecrations of Queen *Elizabeth's* first Bishops, in his excellent Book, intituled,
Anti-

Antiquitates Britannica, printed in the Year 1572. in a spare Leaf, after the *Arms* of all the Bishops of *England*, and before the *Life* of *Augustine*, the first Archbishop of *Canterbury*, you have the Names of the Persons consecrated, the Time when consecrated, what University they were of, and what School Degrees they had taken, and I hope this is another Publication of these Registers, at a Time when all Parties concerned were then living, at least most of them were; for it was within 13 Years after the Time of this Consecration.

AGAIN, The Author of the History of this Archbishop's own Life, has these Words of his Consecration. *Anno Domini 1559.*

Cantuariensis Archiepiscopus electus est a Decano et Capitulo Ecclesie Metropolitane Cantuariensis, posteaque eodem Anno 17. Decemb. adhibitis quatuor Episcopis, Willielmo

Vita Parkeri in Antiquitates Britan.

Cicestrensi, Johanne Herefordensi, Milone quondam Exoniensi, & Johanne Bedfordiensi, lege quadam in hac re lata, Consecratus est. " In the Year 1559.

" he (*viz. Matthew Parker*) was Elected Archbishop of *Canterbury*, by the Dean and Chapter of the Metropolitcal Church of *Canterbury*, and afterwards on the 17. of *December*, in the same Year he was consecrated by the aid of four Bishops, *William Chichester, John Hereford, Miles formerly Bishop of Exeter, and John Bedford*, according to a certain Law made for that purpose.

AND in the Margin over-against the Account he gives of the Bishops consecrated by *Parker*, we have these Words *Hæ Consecrationes & Confirmationes in Registris apparent.* " These Consecra-

tions and Confirmations appear in the Registers.

WE find Mr. *Ward* all along very short in his Examinations into the Subject he writes of. I hope if he had been acquainted with these Passages, he would not have been Guilty of so low a part, as to assert that these Registers were never heard of, nor published till Fifty Years after the Time of this *Lambeth* Consecration; whereas it plainly appears that they were publicly referred to in Parliament, within seven Years of the Time, and that they were published in Part by that very Archbishop, about whose Consecration all this dispute has happened, and in strict Terms refer'd to in his Life, written (probably) by his own Approbation, and all this within 13 Years after the Time that these Things were transacted. If these are not plain Testimonies, not only of the Truth of these Records, but also of the Falshood of what Mr. *Ward* and his Authors have said with respect to their not having been Published until the Year 1613. by Mr. *Mason*; I say if this is not a sufficient Testimony of that, I own I am at a loss to know what is.

BUT this is not all yet, we have another Testimony of these Records, being produced besides these, and that in this very Controversy about Orders, long before Mr. *Mason* engag'd in this Cause; this was in the Conference between *Rainolds* and *Hart*. The account of this Affair I shall give you out of Mr. *Mason*.

“ WHEN *John Hart*, thirty Years ago, denied our Orders, as you do now; the Learned *Rainolds*, out of the Registers of *Edmund Freak*, by whom he was Ordain'd a Priest,

" Priest, and out of *Matthew Parker's* Registers,
 " by whom *Freak* was ordain'd Bishop, transcrib'd
 " the Consecrations, which when *Hart* saw, he
 " presently confess'd, that he thought nothing of
 " that nature could be produced; and therefore he
 " agreed, that that whole Argument should be
 " eras'd and expung'd out of the Conference,
 " that it might not be printed in it, being then
 " to go the Press. This *Rainolds* told me. More-
 " over in his Epistle to that Pious and Learned
 " Man *Thomas Baker*, Rector of *Sobam* in *Suffolk*,
 " he signified the same in Writing, because *Ba-*
 " *ker* was attack'd from the same Quarter, by
 " some Popish Prisoners in *Framlington* Castle;
 " he consulted *Rainolds* by Letter; whose Letter,
 " they sent into *Suffolk*. I have it, being given
 " me by my Friend *Edward Baker*, after his Fa-
 " ther's Death. Another Copy, written by *Rai-*
 " *nolds*'s own Hand, is in the Custody of my
 " Friend *Henry Mason*, (that Learned Divine)
 " formerly Domestick Chaplain to the Right
 " Reverend Father *John* Bishop of *London*, of
 " pious Memory.

BY what has been already produc'd, we may
 easily discover that it is not *Truth*, but *Faction*,
 that makes *Fitz-Simons*, *Fitz-Herbert*, *Champney*
 and *Mr. Ward* so eagerly contend, that these
 Registers were not made publick till fifty odd
 Years, to testify our Consecrations, by *Mr. Mason*;
 and we all know, that where Interest and Faction
 concern themselves to bear down the most evi-
 dent Testimonies, it is in vain to contend; for such
 Men will follow their own Humours in spite of
 Truth, and the most evident Reasons that can be
 brought. But I freely own that such Men, la-
 bouring

bouring under these unhappy Circumstances, are more the Objects of Pity than Resentment.

THEREFORE I desire the Reader to consider the little Weight that is to be put upon what Mr. *Ward* says, with respect to these Registers not being made publick in all the Reign of Queen *Elizabeth*. But Mr. *Ward* goes on to prove this Silence, from some of our Writers of Controversy in those Days. An Examination into this, shall be the Subject of the next Chapter.





C H A P. X.

That there was no Necessity to produce Registers in Queen Elizabeth's Time.

TH E R E is nothing which our Adversaries of *Rome*, and Mr. *Ward*, insist more upon than the Silence of our Controversial Writers, in the beginning of Queen *Elizabeth's* Reign, with respect to these Registers, and consequently they argue from hence, that there were then no such Registers in being.

B U T it appears that they were under no Necessity, from any thing their Adversaries then said, to produce such Evidences for the Regularity of their Ordinations; because the Controversy then turned upon this, that they had no Succession of Doctrine, and that they were not confirm'd by the Pope. They did not mean that they

Fulk de Successione Ecclesiastica passim.

wanted all Consecration, but that they had no lawful Consecration, and in consequence of that, they had none in this limited Sense.

MR. *Harding* is the Man whom I shall single out to prove this, not only because he is one whom Mr. *Ward* refers to, but also because he is very large upon this Head; what others say are only short Hints, from which nothing can be concluded.

THIS Man, in his verbose way, tells Bishop *Jewel*, in Answer to his *Apology*, where *Jewel* says, that a Minister ought to be lawfully call'd. "Ye

say, saith *Harding*, that the Minister ought to be lawfully call'd, and duly order'd to be preferr'd to that

Office of the Church of God — "Whatsoever you mean by your Minister, and by that Office, this are we assur'd of, that in this your new Church, Bishops, Priests, Deacons, Sub-deacons, or any other inferior Orders ye have none.

Bishop *Jewel*, overagainst these last Words in the Margin, writes thus. "Untruth. For it is known we have them." Meaning Bishops, Priests and Deacons.

AGAIN, Mr. *Harding* proceeds. "Ye have abandoned the external Sacrifice and Priesthood of the New Testament, and have not in your Sect Consecrated Bishops. And therefore being without Priests made with laying on of Hands, as Scripture requires all Holy Orders being given by Bishops only: How can you say that any among you can lawfully Minister, or that ye have any lawful Ministers at all.

AGAINST this Bishop *Jewel* in the Margin writs thus. Untruth. For we have neither abandoned the Priesthood, nor the Sacrifice that Christ appointed.

MR.

MR. *Harding* again proceeds, and directs his Discourse particularly to Bishop *Jewel*.

“ How many Bishops of *Salisbury* can you reckon on who preceded you as well in Doctrine; as in outward sitting in that Chair? How many can you tell us of, that being your Predecessors in Order before you, were of your Opinion, and taught the faithful People of that Diocese the Doctrine that you teach? Did Bishop *Capon* teach your Doctrine? Did *Shaxton*? Did *Campegius*? Did Bishop *Audley*? Briefly, did ever any Bishop of that See, before you, teach your Doctrine? It is most certain that they did not.

THIS Passage Mr. *Ward* entirely omits, because he knew this was not to his Purpose: For this shews that the Controversy then was about a Succession of Doctrine. You see Mr. *Ward* can pick and chuse, but you shall have more signal Instances of it presently.

“ BUT to go from your Succession, and to come to your Vocation. — Who hath called you? Who hath laid Hands upon you? — Be you a Priest, or be you not? If you be, who gave you Orders? (*Jewel* here in the Margin, *even he that gave Mr. Harding Orders in the Time of King Edward.*) The Institution of a Priest was never yet but in the Power of a Bishop. Bishops have always after the Apostles Time, according to the Ecclesiastical Canons, been Consecrated by three other Bishops, with the consent of the Metropolitan, and Confirmation of the Bishop of Rome.

“ THIS being true it remaineth, Mr. *Jewel*, you tell us, whether your Vocation be Ordinary or Extraordinary. If Ordinary, shew us the Letters of your Orders. At least, shew us that you have received Power to do the Office you presume to exercise, by due Order of laying on of

“ of Hands and Consecration; but Order and Consecration you have not. To this last Mr. Jewel in the Margin Answers, *A Manifest Untruth. For we have both Order and Consecration.*

You see here, that the main Hinge upon which Mr. *Harding's* Argument turns, is the want of the Confirmation from *Rome*. When he speaks of Consecrations, not one Word of an Ordination at the *Nag's Head*. But hear what Bishop *Jewel* himself says to all this.

“ *HERE* hath Mr. *Harding* taken more Pains than Ordinary. He thought if he could by any Colour make the World believe, we have neither Bishops, nor Priests, nor Deacons, this Day in the Church of *England*, he might the more easily claim the whole Right unto himself.

Bishop *Jewel's* Works, p. 120, Or.

“ *WHERE* you say, Mr. *Harding*, that according to the Ecclesiastical Canons, ever from the Apostles Time, Bishops have evermore been consecrated by three Bishops, with the Confirmation of the Bishop. of *Rome*, as if without him no Man might be allow'd to be a Bishop; ye should not unadvisedly report so manifest an Untruth. For I beseech you, where be these Ecclesiastical Canons? Who devised them? Who made them? Who gave the Pope that singular Privilege, that no Bishop should be admitted in the World but only by him? I remember your Canonists have said, *Papa solo verbo potest facere Episcopum*: The Pope may make a Bishop only by his Word, without any farther Consecration. And Abbot *Panormitane* moveth a Doubt, whether the Pope, by the fullness of his Power, may deprive all the Bishops in the whole World at one time. But this they say that care not greatly what they say.

Page 121.

To

To this Mr. *Harding* answers, after the ancient and modern Popish Manner, viz. nothing to the Purpose. "That among the Canons of the Apostles this is the first; *Episcopus a duobus aut tribus Episcopis ordinatur*, yet you can ask, where be these Ecclesiastical Canons? Who devis'd them? Who made them?

To this Bishop *Jewel* answers. "You forget yourself, Mr. *Harding*, very much; this is not the Question; you are demanded one Thing, and answer another. We deny not the Consecration of three Bishops. We deny not the Confirmation of the Metropolitane. We ourselves are so Consecrated and so Confirmed. The Matter that lyeth between us is this, *Whether through the whole Church of Christ no Man may be allow'd for a Bishop, without the Confirmation of the Pope?* There-to I say, where be your Ecclesiastical Canons? Who devised them? Who made them? If you have them shew them forth hardly, they will further your Cause. If ye have none at all, why should you thus vaunt yourself of empty Story? Why should you talk so vainly of your Ecclesiastical Canons, so old, so ancient, so long continu'd in the Catholick Church, from the Apostles Time, until this Day.

You see here the Question then debated, was not the Consecration at the *Nag's Head*, but the Confirmation of the Bishop of *Rome*. Bishop *Jewel* proceeds.

"WHEREAS it pleaseth you to *Jewel's Works*
call for my Letters of Orders, and p. 129.
to demand of me, as by some Authority, *whether I be a Priest or no? What Hands were laid on me; and by what Order I was made?* I answer you, I am a Priest, made long since, by the same Order and Ordinance, and I think also by the same
"Man

“ Man, and same Hands, that you, Mr. *Harding*,
 “ were made Priest by, in the late Time of that
 “ most virtuous Prince King *Edward* the Sixth.
 “ Therefore ye cannot well doubt of my Priesthood,
 “ without like doubting of your own.

“ FURTHER, as if you were my *Metropolitane*,
 “ ye demand of me, *whether I be a Bishop or no?* I
 “ answer you, I am a Bishop, and that by the free
 “ accustomed Canonical Election of the whole
 “ Chapter of *Salisbury*, assembled solemnly toge-
 “ ther for that purpose; of which Company you
 “ Mr. *Harding* were then one, and, as I was
 “ informed, being there present in your own
 “ Person, among your Brethren, gave free, and
 “ and open Consent unto the Election. If you de-
 “ ny this, take heed least your own Breath blow
 “ not against you.

“ As for the impertinent Tales of *Ischyra* and
 “ *Zacchaeus*, they touch us nothing, they were none of
 “ ours, we know them not. Our Bishops are made in
 “ Form, and Order, as they have been ever by free
 “ election of the Chapter, by consecration of the Arch-
 “ Bishop, and other three Bishops, and by the ad-
 “ mission of the Prince. And in this Sort, not
 “ long since, the Pope himself was admitted. And
 “ as *Platina* saith, without the Emperor's Letters
 “ Patent, the Pope was no Pope, as hereafter it
 “ shall be shewed more at large.

“ To be short, we succeed the Bishops that have
 “ been before our Days; we are Elected, Confe-
 “ crated, Confirmed, and Admitted, as they were.
 “ If they were deceived in any thing, we succeed
 “ them in Place, but not in Error. They were our
 “ Predecessors, but not the Rulers and Standards of
 “ our Faith. Or rather, to set apart all Compari-
 “ son of Persons, the Doctrine of *Christ* this Day,
 “ Mr. *Harding*, succeedeth your Doctrine, as the
 “ Day

" Day succeedeth the Night, as the Light succeedeth the Darkness, and as the Truth succeedeth Error,

I have here given you a view of this Controversy as it stood in the Days of Queen *Elizabeth*; whereby it appears, that they then only deny'd our Consecrations in general Terms, and the *Medium* whereby they then pretend to prove these general Assertions was the want of the Confirmation of the Bishops of *Rome*, which they pretended at that Time, to be essential to Ordination. This Point Bishop *Jewel* is very large in Opposing, as well as another, of the want of Succession in the same Doctrine. As to the rest, I have given you his Answers, which you see are only General, that he was Consecrated by three Bishops, as the Apostolical Canon directs, nor was he under any necessity to produce Records, at that time of Day; for the Consecrations were fresh in the Memory of all Men, and particularly in that of his Antagonist Mr. *Harding*, whom it appears was one of the Chapter of *Salisbury*, at the time of his Election. So that to produce Records against such a Man, who was acquainted with the whole Transaction, would be impertinent: therefore *Jewel* (who well knew where the stress of their Arguments lay, and upon which they depended) goes on immediately to prove that the Pope had no lawful Authority here, nor any where else, but in his own district or Diocese, and consequently, that our Ordinations are valid and good, tho' they were perform'd without the Pope's Authority. This is the true State of the Case, as it will appear to any Body that will be at the trouble to consult the controversy at large in *Jewel's Works*.

FROM hence therefore I am sure, that the impartial Reader will conclude, as well as I, that Mr. *Ward's* Argument drawn from the silence of our Writers.

Writers, with respect to these Records, is equally inconclusive with the rest; for it appears they were under no manner of Necessity to produce these, as a Testimony of the Validity of their Consecrations at that Time.

BUT on the contrary he must conclude, the Silence of the Popish Writers of that Age with respect to the *Nag's Head* Fable, is a certain Sign, that there was no such Thing ever acted otherwise, there is no Doubt to be made, but they would have made Use of it to cast a Blemish upon the Reformation; and therefore as this Story is false, these Records must be reputed the Registers of the true Consecrations.





C H A P. XI.

That Episcopacy was reputed a divine Institution in Queen Elizabeth's Days.

MY Design was to have concluded with the last Chapter, but since this Book went to the Press, I consider'd that nothing is more frequent in the Mouths and Writings of our Adversaries, than that it was the general Doctrine of Queen Elizabeth's Reign, that the Order of a Bishop was not *Jure Divino*, if it be consider'd as a distinct Order from that of a Presbyter; I therefore thought it necessary, in this Place, to say something to this Charge; especially since the Author now under Examination, frequently advanceth it in several Places of his Book; and he concludes from thence, that as the Church of *England* did not then think the Order of Bishops necessary to the Constitution of a Church, She was therefore the less Solicitous to preserve the Regularity of their Ordinations.

IT

It must be confess'd, that some Writers of that Age are too favourable towards this ridiculous Opinion, but I do not see how this is an evidence of the General Judgment of the then Church of *England*. For it has always been complain'd of, by all Parties, as a great Hardship to charge any Church with the sentiments of private Men, and none more forward in complaints of this Nature, than the Vassals of the Court of *Rome*, tho' none so frequent as themselves in the Practice of it.

THE Judgment of Dr. *Whitaker* has often been cast in our Teeth upon this Occasion; but must the Opinion of such an *Apocryphal* Writer as he was, pass for the Judgment of our Church? Must his particular Systems pass for the Establish'd Doctrine of the Church of *England*? When he defends the undoubted Principles of the Christian Religion Establish'd in the Church of *England*, he is so far a Doctor of that Church; but when he deviates from these, he is no longer a Christian Doctor, but a Doctor of Anti-Christ; and we are not responsible for what he, or any other private Man whatsoever, may have written.

I am afraid we have Instances even in this Age; of Fathers in the Church that never were true Sons; but will future Generations be so inconsiderate, as to say, that they deserve the Titles they bear, or that the Heresies which they have advanc'd are the present establish'd Doctrines of the Church of *England*; I hope not, for no Opinions are to be imputed to the Church, but such as are found in her publick *Liturgies* and *Ordinals*, and the rest of her *Synodical* Determinations; and when any Man transgresseth these Rules, whether he is a pretended Father, or a pretended Son, he evidently proves himself to be of a spurious Original.

BUT if we examine into the Principles of the governing Part of the Church of *England*, even in their private Capacities, as private Writers, we shall find them to be very far from denying the Divine Right of Episcopacy.

ARCHBISHOP *Parker* himself (who is so nearly concern'd in this whole Debate) in his immortal Book, *De Antiquitate Britannicæ Ecclesiæ*, gives undoubted Testimonies of his Adherence to the Cause of Episcopacy: for what else is the Subject of that Book, but an Account of the Lives of his Predecessors in the See of *Canterbury*, and of their Archiepiscopal Acts, and wherein he advanceth to the height the Dignity of that See: To prove this by any particular Passages out of it, were rather to trifle than to prove the Point.

THE general undoubted Histories of these Times are so full with respect to this Point, that nothing short of *Romish* Modesty can maintain the contrary. However, for the Satisfaction of the deluded, I will present the Reader with some Passages out of a Book publish'd by one of Queen *Elizabeth's* learned Bishops upon the Subject of Episcopacy; not only because they will for ever silence this Clamour, but also for this Reason, that they are strong Lines, and equal to the Taste of the politest Age. His Words are these.

“ WHEN I saw the Peace of God’s
 “ Church violated by the sharpness of
 “ some Mens Humours, and their
 “ Tongues so intemperate, that they
 “ could not be discern’d from open Enemies; I
 “ thought, as in a common Danger, not to sit look-
 “ ing till all were on Fire, but rather by all means
 “ to try what kind of Liquor would extinguish this
 “ Flame.

Bishop Bil-
 son’s perpetual
 Government of
 Christ’s Church.
 In the Preface:

" ANOTHER Reason leading me to this Enter-
 " prize, was the discharge of my Duty to God and
 " her Majesty. For finding that some Men broach-
 " ed their disciplinary Devises under the Title of
 " God's Eternal Truth, and profess'd they could
 " no more forsake the defence thereof, than of the
 " Christian Faith; and others defac'd and reproach-
 " ed the Government of the Church here received
 " and establish'd, as *Unlawful, Irreligious, and An-*
 " *tichristian*, (for what Lees are so sowre that some
 " hedgeWines will not yield?) I was mov'd in Con-
 " science, not to suffer the Sacred Scripture to be
 " so violently Arrested and Over-rul'd by the Sum-
 " mons and Censures of their new Consistories; as
 " also to clear this State of that injurious Slander,
 " as if not knowing or neglecting the manifest
 " Voice of Christ's Spirit, we had entertain'd and
 " preferr'd the dregs of Antichrist's Pride and
 " Tyranny.

" THESE Causes, of great and good Regard,
 " led me to examine the chief Grounds of both
 " Disciplines, theirs and ours, that by comparing,
 " it might appear which Side came nearest to the
 " sincerity of the Scriptures, and Society of the
 " ancient and uncorrupt Church of Christ.

ibid.

" How the Apostles impos'd Hands,
 " and deliver'd unto *Satan*, and who
 " joyn'd with them in these Actions, I have han-
 " dled in Places appointed for that purpose :
 " whereby we shall perceive, that tho' the *Presby-*
 " *ters* of each Church had charge of the Word and
 " Sacraments, even in the Apostles Times; yet
 " might they not impose Hands, nor use the Keys
 " without the Apostles, or such as the Apostles, de-
 " parting or dying, left to be their Substitutes and
 " Successors, in the Churches which they had plant-
 " ed.

" ed. At *Samaria* *Philip* *Preach'd* *Acts* 8. 5, 12.
 " and *Baptis'd*; and albeit he dispens'd
 " the Word and Sacraments, yet could he not im-
 " pose Hands on them; but *Peter* and
 " *John* came from *Jerusalem*, and laid *Acts* 8. 17.
 " their Hands on them, and so they receiv'd the Holy
 " Ghost. The Churches of *Lystra*, *Ico-*
 " *nium*, and *Antioch* were planted be- *Acts* 14. 21.
 " fore, yet were *Paul* and *Barnabas*, at their return
 " forced to encrease the Number of *Presbyters* in
 " each of those Places, by imposition of their
 " Hands; for so the Word *χειροτονιας*
 " signifieth with all *Greek* Divines and *Acts* 14. 23.
 " Stories, as I have sufficiently prov'd; and not
 " to ordain by Election of the People, as some
 " Men of late had new framed the Text. The
 " Churches of *Ephesus* and *Crete* were erected by
 " *Paul*, and had their *Presbyteries*, yet could they
 " not create others; but *Timothy* and *Titus* were left
 " there to impose Hands, and ordain Elders in every
 " City, as occasion required.

" Herein who succeeded the Apostles, whether
 " all *Presbyters* equally, or certain chief and Cho-
 " sen Men; one in every Church and City were
 " trusted with the Government both of People and
 " *Presbyters*, I have largely debated, and made it
 " plain, as well by the Scriptures, as by other
 " antient Writers, past all exception; that from
 " the Apostles to the first *Nicene* Council, and so
 " along to this our Age, there have always been
 " selected some, of greater Gifts then the Residue,
 " to succeed in the Apostles Places; to whom it
 " belong'd both to moderate the *Presbyters* of every
 " Church, and to take the special Charge of im-
 " position of Hands; and this their Singularity in
 " succeeding, and Superiority in ordaining, have
 " been observ'd from the Apostles Time, as the

“ peculiar and substantial Marks of Episcopal Power and Calling.

“ I know some late Writers vehemently spurne at this ; and hardly endure any difference between *Presbyters* and *Bishops*, unless it be by Custom and Consent of Men, but in no Case by any Order or Institution of the Apostles, whose Opinions, together with the Authorities on which they build, I have according to my small Skill, examin'd, and find them no way able to rebate the full and sound Evidence that is for the contrary. For what more pregnant Probation can be requir'd, than that the same Power and Precepts which *Paul* gave to *Timothy*, when he had the Charge of *Ephesus*, remain'd in all the Churches throughout the World, to certain special and try'd Persons, authoriz'd by the Apostles themselves, and from them deriv'd to their successors, by a general and perpetual Succession in every Church and City, without Conference to enlarge it, or Council to decree it ; the continuing whereof, for three Discents, the Apostles saw with their Eyes, confirm'd with their Hands, and *St. John* amongst others witnessed with his Pen, as an Order of ruling the Church, approv'd by the exprefs Voice of the Son of God. When the Original proceeded from the Apostles Mouth, and was observ'd in all the famous Places and Churches of Christendom, where the Apostles taught, and while they liv'd ; can any Man doubt whether that Course of Governing the Church were Apostolick ? For my Part, I confess I am neither so wise as to over-reach it with Policy, nor so wayward as to withstand it with Obstinacy.

Ibid.

“ When *Paul* left *Timothy* at *Ephesus*
 “ to impose Hands, and to receive Accu-
 “ sations

“ *sations against Presbyters, and openly to rebuke such*
 “ *as sinn'd* ; did he not give him Power over *Presby-*
 “ *ters*, and even the self same that is challeng'd at
 “ this Day to belong to the Bishops? If it were
 “ lawful and needful at *Ephesus* for *Timothy* to have
 “ Right and Authority over the *Presbyters*, that
 “ were Joynt-Pastors with him, How cometh it now
 “ to be a Tyrannical and Antichristian Power in
 “ his Successors ?

By such a Preface, you may easily guess what the Contents of the Book must be, and whether the Orthodox Part of the Church of *England*, and her regular Clergy, did not esteem Episcopacy to be of Divine Institution. This Man, and his Principles, received a very publick Mark of Approbation from Queen *Elizabeth*, within three Years after the Publication of this Book. He was consecrated to the See of *Worcester*, on the 13th of *June*, 1596 ; in which Place he did not continue long, for the Queen, still further regarding the Merit of the Man, translated him to *Winchester*, in the Year 1597.

IT is a surprizing Thing to find any Man so destitute of all Modesty, as to assert, that the Episcopal Function was, in Queen *Elizabeth's* Days, not reputed a necessary Function, or of Divine Institution ; whereas our Laws and publick Ordinals, and other Ecclesiastical Ordinances then establish'd, do so openly testify and declare the contrary : to mention nothing more of private Writers, who maintain'd it with as much holy Zeal as you find the Learned *Bilson* has done.

NOR is it the *Romanists* only that have taken a fancy to assert this ; but I further find that some of our present Puritans have very lately taken upon them to maintain the same Thing in some of their silly Pamphlets, notwithstanding even their

own present existence is an evident Testimony against them. But when Men once take it into their Heads to frame Histories agreeable to their own Humours, without the least regard to Truth and Fact, what shall a Man say? Every honest Man must have some Concern upon him, to see People by such Means as these (tho' common Enemies to our Church) forfeit all Right, and Title to civil Society; For when Men so evidently contradict such undoubted Truths, they render themselves incapable by such a Behaviour, of that Confidence and mutual Credit, so necessary to be observ'd and cultivated between Man and Man.





THE CONCLUSION.

I HAVE now done with Mr. *Ward*, I have consider'd all his Arguments, and have conceal'd the force of none of them; and now I think it no breach of Modesty to say, that they appear in a very contemptible Light.

BUT however contemptible they may be, yet he has the Confidence to conclude from such false premises, that we have no true Priesthood, and consequently that we have no Sacraments, nor no Church; but you see he reckons without his Host, for I have prov'd the contrary of this, I have shew'd him his Errors in the Premises, and therefore the Conclusions he draws from such false Principles, must be equally false. We have in spite of *Rome*, a true Priesthood, true Sacraments, and a true Church, and consequently all Things necessary to Salvation,

I would I could say the same of them; that they had an uncorrupted Church, uncorrupted Priests, and uncorrupted Sacraments; but they have so incumber'd the Institutions of Christ, with so many pitiful Novelties, that neither their Priesthood, their Sacraments, nor their Church, are such as Christ Instituted them. Indeed the Providence of God interpos'd so far, as to preserve among them the Essentials of Ordination, and in a limited Sense they may be said to have true Priests, true Sacraments, and a true Church. The Difference between their Church and ours is, that they have notoriously Corrupted theirs, and we have Reform'd ours agreeable to the first Institution.

I have for the Reader's satisfaction subjoin'd the Succession of our Bishops from those in *Henry the VIIIth's* Days, to Archbishop *Parker*, and the consequence of that is, if their Bishops are true Bishops ours are so too.

Matth. Parker, conf. 17. Dec. 1559. by

Will. Barlow, } both proved to be consecrated in
John Hodgkins, } *Hen. VIIIth's* Days.

Miles Coverdale, } conf. both Aug. 13. 1551. by
John Scory,

Tho. Cranmer, } conf. in *Hen. VIIIth's* Time.
John Hodgskins,

Nicolas Ridley, conf. 5. Sept. 1547. }

By

By { *Hen. Lincoln,*
 John Bedford. } all conf. in *Hen. VIIIth's* Time.
 Tho. Sidon.

So that you see here is the Succession as prov'd in the Body of this Book; the Consecrations in *Henry* the Eighth's Days; they do not dispute, nor do they dispute the Succession from *Parker* down to this day.





AN
APPENDIX
OF
RECORDS.



HAVE here annexed two Records, because they are not commonly to be met with by every Reader, and because they are very essential in the Determination of this Controversy.

THE First is Bishop Bonner's Certificate to Scory Bishop of Chichester, that he had put away his Wife, according to the Laws in Queen Mary's Days against the Marriage of the Clergy; but the principal Reason of its being produced here, is to shew that this Scory was by Bonner stil'd Bishop of Chichester, and he being one of Archbishop Parker's Consecrators, I have thought this Record

cord so material, as to suffer it to have a Place in this Appendix.

THE Second Record is the Statute made in the Eighth Year of Queen *Elizabeth*, which doth in Terms establish the Ordinal of King *Edward* the Sixth, whereby it appeareth that this was the Ordinal used in the beginning of Queen *Elizabeth's* Reign, which effectually destroyeth the Story of the *Nag's Head*, and confirms the veracity of the *Lambeth* Records, by so publick an Appeal to them, within seven Years after the Fact they are Records of: besides this Act further sheweth the unreasonableness of that Popish Clamour, as if our Bishops had no Spiritual but Parliamentary Authority; whereas it appeareth by this very act, upon which all this noise is grounded, that our Bishops were consecrated by King *Edward's* Ordinal, and that the Parliament only interposed to make those Consecrations Legal; because this Ordinal was abolished by Act of Parliament in Queen *Mary's* Time, and consequently required such an Act as this, to take away that Illegality fixed upon it by the *Marian* Act.





N U M B. I.

*Bonner's Certificate, that Bishop Scory
had put away his Wife.*

“ **E**DMUNDUS permissione Divina Lon-
 “ don. Episcopus, universis & sin-
 “ gulis Christi fidelibus, ad quos
 “ presentes literæ nostræ Testimo-
 “ niales pervenerint; ac eis præfer-
 “ tim quos infra Scripta tangunt, seu tangere
 “ poterint quomodolibet in futurum, Salutem in
 “ Auctore Salutis & fidem indubiam presentibus
 “ adhibere. Quia boni Pastoris officium tunc nos
 “ rite exequi arbitramur, cum ad exemplar Christi
 “ errantes oves ad caulam Domini gregis redu-
 “ cimus, & Ecclesiæ Christi, quæ redeunti gre-
 “ mium non claudit, restituimus; & quia delectus
 “ confrater noster *Joannes super Cicesrien. Epis-*
 “ *copus* in Dioc. & Jurisdictione nostris London.
 “ ad

“ ad præsens residentiam & moram faciens; qui
 “ olim laxatis Pudicitæ & castitatis habenis, con-
 “ tra Sacros Canones & Sanctorum Patrum decre-
 “ ta ad illicitas & prohibitas convolavit nuptias;
 “ se ea ratione non Solum Ecclesiastic. Sacrament.
 “ pertractand. omnino indignum; verum etiam
 “ a publica officii sui pastoralis functione privatum
 “ & suspensum reddens, transactæ licentiosæ vitæ
 “ valde pœnitentem & deplorantem, plurimis Ar-
 “ gumentis se declaravit, ac pro commissis peni-
 “ tentiam alias per nos sibi injunctum Salutarem,
 “ aliquo temporis tractu in cordis sui amaritudine
 “ & animi dolore peregit, vitam hæcenus degens
 “ laudabilem, spemq; faciens id se in posterum
 “ facturum atq; ob id ad Ecclesiasticæ ac Pastora-
 “ lis Functionis Statum, Saltem cum quodam
 “ temperamento, justitia exigente, reponend. hinc
 “ est quod nos præmissa, ac humilem *dicti confratris nostri* petitionem pro reconciliatione sua
 “ habenda & obtinenda considerantes, ejus precibus,
 “ favorabiliter inclinati, eundem *Confratrem nostrum*
 “ ad publicam Ecclesiastici Ministerii &
 “ officii sui Pastoralis Functionem & Executionem,
 “ infra Dioc. nostram London. exercend. quate-
 “ nus de jure possumus & absq; cujusq; præju-
 “ dicio restituimus, rehabilitavimus & redinte-
 “ gravimus; prout tenore præsentium sic restitui-
 “ mus, rehabilitamus, & redintegramus; Sacro
 “ Sanctæ Ecclesiæ clementia & Christiana Charitate
 “ id exigentibus. Vobis igitur universis & singulis
 “ Supradictis præfatum confratrem nostrum, sic
 “ ut præmittitur restitutum, rehabilitatum & re-
 “ dintegratum fuisse, & esse ad omnes effectus Su-
 “ pradictos significamus & notificamus per præ-
 “ sentes Sigillo nostro Sigillat. Dat. in Manerio
 “ nostro de Fulham Die Mensis Julii Anno Dom.
 “ 1554. & nostræ Transla. Anno 15.



NUMB. II.

Anno Octavo Reginae Elizabethæ.

An Act declaring the Making and Consecrating of the Archbishops and Bishops of this Realm, to be Good, Lawful and Perfect.

“ **F**ORASMUCH as divers Questions
 “ by overmuch boldness of Speech
 “ and Talk, among many of the
 “ Common Sort of People being
 “ unlearned, hath lately grown
 “ upon the Making and Consecrating of Arch-
 “ bishops and Bishops within this Realm, whether
 “ the same were and be duly and orderly made
 “ and done according to Law or not, which is
 “ much tending to the Slander of all the State of
 “ Clergy, being one of the greatest States of
 “ this Realm : Therefore for the avoiding of such
 “ Slanderous Speech, and to the intent that every
 “ Man

“ Man that is willing to know the truth, may
 “ plainly understand that the same evil Speech
 “ and Talk is not grounded
 “ upon any just Matter or
 “ Cause; it is thought convenient hereby partly to touch
 “ such Authorities as do allow
 “ and approve the making and
 “ consecrating of the same Archbishops and Bishops
 “ to be duly and orderly done according to the
 “ Laws of this Realm, and thereupon further to
 “ provide for the more surety thereof, as hereafter
 “ shall be express’d.

By this Introduction, the
 intelligent Reader may see
 that the Statute referreth
 only to the Validity of our
 Episcopacy, in the Eye of
 our own Laws.

II “ F I R S T, It is very well known to all De-
 “ grees of this Realm, that the late King of most
 “ famous Memory, King *Henry* the Eighth, as
 “ well by all the Clergy then of this Realm in
 “ their several Convocations, as also by all the
 “ Lords Spiritual and Temporal, and Commons
 “ assembled in divers of his Parliaments, was
 “ justly and rightly Recognized and acknowledged
 “ to have the supream Power, Jurisdiction, Order,
 “ Rule, and Authority over all the Estate Ecclesi-
 “ astical of the same, and the same Power, Juris-
 “ diction and Authority did use accordingly: And
 “ that also the said late King in the five and Twen-
 “ tieth Year of his Reign, did by Authority of
 “ Parliament, among other Things, set forth a
 “ certain Order of the Manner and Form how
 “ Archbishops and Bishops within this Realm, and
 “ other his Dominions, should be elected and made,
 “ as by the same more plainly appeareth: And
 “ that also the late King of worthy Memory, King
 “ *Edward* the Sixth, did lawfully succeed the said
 “ late King *Henry* his Father, in the Imperial
 “ Crown of this Realm, and did justly possess
 “ and enjoy all the said Power, Jurisdiction and
 “ Authority

“ Authority beforemention’d, as a Thing defended
 “ with the same Imperial Crown, and so used the
 “ same during his Life: And that also the said late
 “ King *Edward* the Sixth in his Time, by Authori-
 “ ty of Parliament, caused a godly and virtuous
 “ Book entituled, *The Book of Common Prayer, and*
 “ *Administration of Sacraments, and other Rites and*
 “ *Ceremonies of the Church of England*, to be made
 “ and set forth; not only for one uniform Order
 “ of Service, Common-Prayer, and the Administ-
 “ ration of the Sacraments, to be us’d in this
 “ Realm and other his Dominions, but also did add
 “ and put to the same Book, a very good and godly
 “ Order, of the Manner and Form how Archbi-
 “ shops, Bishops, Priests, Deacons, and Ministers
 “ should from Time to Time be consecrated, made,
 “ and ordered within this Realm, and other his
 “ Dominions, as by the same more plainly will and
 “ may appear: And altho in the Time of the late
 “ Queen *Mary*, as well the said Act and Statute
 “ made in the five and Twentieth Year of the
 “ Reign of the said late King *Henry* the Eighth, as
 “ also the several Acts and Statutes made in the
 “ second, third, fourth, fifth and sixth Years of the
 “ Reign of the said late King *Edward*, for the Au-
 “ thority and allowing of the said Book of Com-
 “ mon Prayer, and other the Premises, amongst
 “ divers other Acts and Statutes, touching the said
 “ supream Authority, were Repeal’d, yet never-
 “ theless, at the Parliament holded at *Westminster*;
 “ in the first Year of the Reign of our Sovereign
 “ Lady, the Queen’s Majesty, that now is, by one
 “ other Act and Statute there made, all such Ju-
 “ risdictions, Privileges, Superiorities, Prehemi-
 “ nences, Spiritual and Ecclesiastical; as by any
 “ Spiritual or Ecclesiastical Power, Authority hath
 “ heretofore been, or may lawfully be us’d over
 “ the

" the Ecclesiastical Estate of this Realm, and the
 " Order, Reformation, and Correction of the same,
 " is fully and absolutely, by the Authority of the
 " same Parliament, united and annex'd to the Im-
 " perial Crown of this Realm: And by the same
 " Act and Statute there is also given to the Queen's
 " Highness, her Heirs and Successors, Kings and
 " Queens of this Realm, full Power and Authori-
 " ty by Letters Patents under the Great Seal of
 " *England*, from time to time to Assign, Name,
 " and Authorise such Person or Persons as she and
 " they shall think meet and convenient, to exer-
 " cise, use, occupy and execute under her Highness,
 " all manner of Jurisdictions, Privileges, Prehe-
 " minences and Authorities, in any wise touching
 " or concerning any Spiritual or Ecclesiastical Po-
 " wer or Jurisdiction within this Realm, or any
 " other her Highness's Dominions or Countries:
 " And also by the same Statute, the said Act made
 " in the five and Twentieth Year of the Reign of
 " the said late King *Henry* the Eighth, for the Or-
 " der and Form of the Electing and making of the
 " said Archbishops and Bishops, together with di-
 " vers other Statutes touching the Jurisdiction over
 " the State Ecclesiastical, is revived, and made in
 " full Force and Effect, as by the same Act and
 " Statute plainly appeareth: And that also by
 " another Act and Statute made in the said Parlia-
 " ment, in the first Year of the Reign of our said
 " Sovereign Lady, entituled, *An Act for the Uni-*
 " *formity of Common Prayer, and Service in the*
 " *Church, and Administration of the Sacraments, and*
 " *other the said Orders, Rites, and Ceremonies before-*
 " *mention'd*, and all Things therein contain'd, with
 " certain Additions therein newly added and ap-

L

pointed

" pointed by the said Statute, is fully *Etablish'd and

" Authoris'd to be used in all

* This part of the Statute sheweth, that the Ordinal was reputed to be effectually Etablish'd by the 1 of Eliz.

" Places within this Realm, and

" all other the Queen's Ma-

" jesty's Dominions and Coun-

" tries, as by the said Act a-

" mong other Things plainly appeareth: Where-

" upon our said Sovereign Lady, the Queen's most

" Excellent Majesty, being most justly and law-

" fully invested in the Imperial Crown of this

" Realm, with all Authorities, Preheminences and

" Dignities thereunto appertaining: And thereby

" having in her Majesty's Order and Disposition,

" all the said Jurisdictions, Power and Authorities

" over the Estate Ecclesiastical and Temporal, as

" well in cases Ecclesiastical as Temporal, within

" this Realm, and other her Majesty's Dominions

" and Countries, hath by her supream Authority,

" at divers Times since the beginning of her Ma-

" jesty's Reign, caused divers and sundry grave

" and well Learned Men to be duly Elected, made

" and consecrated Archbishops and Bishops of di-

" vers Archbishopricks and Bishopricks within this

" Realm, and other her Majesty's Dominions and

" Countries, according to such Or-

" Order and * Form, and with

" such Ceremonies in and about

" their Consecration, as well al-

" low'd and set forth by the

" said Acts, Statutes and Orders

" annex'd to the said Book of

" Common Prayer beforemention'd:

" And further, for the avoiding

" of all Ambiguities and Questions that might be

" objected against the lawful Confirmations, In-

" vestings, and Consecrations of the said Archbi-

" shops and Bishops, her Highness in her Letters

" Patents

* This part of the Act proves Queen Elizabeth's first Bishops to be consecrated by King Edward's Liturgy, which was then annexed to the Common Prayer, and if so, how could they be consecrated at the Nag's Head by Scory who is said to have used a Form of his own.

“ Patents under the great Seal of *England*, directed
 “ to any Archbishop Bishop, or others, for the
 “ Confirming, Investing and Consecrating of any
 “ Person elected to the Office or Dignity of any
 “ Archbishop or Bishop, hath not only used such
 “ Words and Sentences as were accustomed to be
 “ used by the said late King *Henry* and King *Ed-*
 “ *ward*, her Majesty’s Father and Brother, in
 “ their like Letters Patents made for such Causes;
 “ but also hath used and put in her Majesty’s said
 “ Letters Patents, divers other general Words and
 “ Sentences, whereby her Highness, by her supream
 “ Power and Authority, hath dispensed with all
 “ Causes or Doubts of any imperfection or disa-
 “ bility, that can or may in any wise be objected
 “ against the same, as by her said Majesty’s Let-
 “ ters Patents remaining of Record, more plainly
 “ will appear: So that to all those that will well
 “ consider of the Effect and true Intent of the
 “ said Laws and Statutes, and of the supream and
 “ absolute Authority of the Queen’s Highness, and
 “ which she by her Majesty’s said Letters Patents
 “ hath used and put in ure, in and about the
 “ making and Consecrating of the said Archbi-
 “ shops and Bishops, it is and may be very evi-
 “ dent and apparent, that no cause of Scruple,
 “ Ambiguity, or doubt can or may justly be ob-
 “ jected against the said Elections, Confirmations,
 “ or Consecrations, or any other material Thing
 “ meet to be used or had in or about the same;
 “ but that every Thing requisite and material for
 “ that purpose, hath been made and done as pre-
 “ cisely, and with as great care and diligence, or
 “ rather more, as ever the like was done before
 “ her Majesty’s Time, *as the Records of her Majesty’s*
 “ *said Father’s and Brother’s Time, and also of her own*
 “ *Time, will more plainly testify and declare.*

III. " WHEREFORE for the plain Declaration of
 " all the Premises, and to the intent that the same
 " may the better be known to every of the Queen's
 " Majesty's Subjects, whereby such evil Speech as
 " hath been used against the high State of Prelacy,
 " may hereafter cease; Be it now declared and
 " enacted by the Authority of this present Parlia-
 " ment, that the said Act and Statute made in the
 " first Year of our said Sovereign Lady the Queen's
 " Majesty, whereby the said Book of Common
 " Prayer, and the Administration of the Sacra-
 " ments, with other Rites and Ceremonies, is au-
 " thoris'd and allowed to be us'd, shall stand and
 " remain good and perfect to all intents and pur-
 " poses: and that such Order and Form for the
 " consecrating of Archbishops and Bishops, and
 " for the making of Priests, Deacons and Ministers,
 " as was set forth in the Time of the said late
 " King *Edward* the Sixth, and added to the said
 " Book of Common Prayer, and authoris'd by Par-
 " liament in the fifth and sixth Years of the said
 " late King, shall stand and be in full force and
 " effect, and shall from henceforth be used and ob-
 " served in all Places within this Realm, and other
 " the Queen's Majesty's Dominions and Countries.

IV. " And that all Acts and things heretofore
 " had, made or done, by any Person or Persons, in
 " or about any Consecration, Confirmation, or In-
 " vesting of any Person or Persons elected to the
 " Office or Dignity of any Archbishop or Bishop
 " within this Realm, or within any other the
 " Queens Majesty's Dominions or Countries, by
 " virtue of the Queens Majesty's Letters Patents
 " or Commissions, since the beginning of her Reign,
 " be and shall be by Authority of this present Par-
 " liament, declared, judged and deemed, at and
 " from every of the several times of the doing
 " there-

“ thereof, good and perfect to all respects and
 “ purposes ; any Matter or Thing that can or may
 “ be objected to the contrary thereof in any wise
 “ notwithstanding.

V. “ AND that all Persons that have been or
 “ shall be made made, ordered,
 “ or consecrated Archbishops, Bi-
 “ shops, Priests, Ministers of God’s
 “ holy Word and Sacraments, or
 “ Deacons, after the Form and
 “ Order prescribed in the said Form
 “ and Order how Archbishops, Bishops, Priests,
 “ Deacons and Ministers should be consecrated,
 “ made and ordered, be in every Deed, and also
 “ by Authority hereof declared and enacted to be,
 “ and shall be Archbishops, Bishops, Priests, Mi-
 “ nisters and Deacons, and rightly made, ordered
 “ and Consecrated ; any Statute, Law, Canon, or
 “ other Thing to the contrary notwithstanding.

This Clause shew-
 eth that all the Bi-
 shops before this Act
 were consecrated by
 King *Edward’s* Li-
 turgie, this confutes
 the *Nags-Head* Fable.

VI. “ PROVIDED always, and nevertheless be
 “ it enacted by the Authority aforesaid, That no
 “ Person or Persons shall at any Time hereafter be
 “ impeach’d or molested, in Body, Lands, Living or
 “ Goods, by occasion or means of any Certificate,
 “ by any Archbishop or Bishop heretofore made, or
 “ before the last Day of this present Session of
 “ Parliament to be made, by virtue of any Act
 “ made in the first Session of this present Parlia-
 “ ment, touching or concerning the refusal of the
 “ Oath declared and set forth by Act of Parlia-
 “ ment, in the first Year of the Reign of our So-
 “ veraign Lady Queen *Elizabeth* ; any thing in this
 “ Act, or any other Statute heretofore made to the
 “ contrary notwithstanding.

VII. “ And that all tenders of the said Oath
 “ made by any Archbishop or Bishop aforesaid, or
 “ before the last Day of this present Session, to be
 “ made

“ made by Authority of any Act establish’d in the
“ first Session of this present Parliament, and all
“ refusals of the same Oath so tendered, or before
“ the last Day of this present Session, to be ten-
“ dered by any Archbishop or Bishop, by Autho-
“ rity of any Act establish’d in the first Session of
“ this present Parliament, shall be void and of
“ none effect or validity in the Law.

An ADVERTISEMENT to the READER.

OUR Adversaries of Rome frequently make a very great Noise about the Editions of Books which are us'd in Controversies with them, and generally speaking, upon very slender Grounds; but none so careless as they themselves are in this particular; for even this very Writer Quotes Pages of Books that have bore several Editions, without making us acquainted with what Edition he has us'd: Nay worse than this, he has refer'd us to consult the Pages of Authors that have written several Books, without saying one Word which of their Books he refers to; and what can be the Design of this, but to amuse his Reader, and render an enquiry into the sincerity of his Quotations the more difficult. But, to avoid all difficulties and disputes upon this Head, I have here given the Reader an Account of the Editions of all those Books which I have us'd, and which I have had any Occasion to mention in the foregoing Treatise.

FOLIOS.

Rymer's <i>Fœdera</i> To. 14, 15.	London 1713
Keble's <i>Statutes at large</i> .	London 1681
Burnet's <i>History of the Reformation</i> 3 Vol.	ibid 1715
Howel's <i>Synopsis Canonum &c.</i> 2 Vol.	ibid 1708
Cave's <i>Historia Literaria</i> , 2 Vol	ibid 1688
Bellarmini <i>Opera Controversialia</i> 3 Vol.	Paris 1620
Mason's <i>Vindicia Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ</i>	Londini 1625
Mason's <i>English Edition</i>	London 1613
Bishop Jewel's <i>Works</i>	ibid 1611
Heylin's <i>History of the Reformation</i>	ibid 1674
Parker's <i>Antiquitates Britanica</i>	Hanoviae 1605
Bini's <i>Concilia Generalia</i> , 10 Vol.	Paris 1636
Morinus <i>De Sacris Ecclesiæ Ordinationibus</i> .	Antverpiæ 1685

QUARTO.

[152]

QUARTO.

Godwin *De Prasulibus Angliae* Londini 1616
 Kellison's *Survey of the new Religion.* Doway 1605
 Sparrow's *Collection of Articles, &c.* London 1675
 Billson's *Perpetual Government of Christ's Church.*
 London 1593

OCTAVO.

Bramhall's *Consecration and Succession of Protestant
 Bishops justify'd* Gravenhagh 1658
 Brideaux's *Validity of the Orders of the Church of
 England* London 1716
 Kellison's *Reply to Sutcliff's Answer to the Survey of
 the New Religion* Rhemes 1608
 Fulk's *Answer to Stapleton's Fortrefs.* London 1580



THE

QUARTO.

CONTENTS.

T HE validity of the English Forms of Ordination	Page 1.
That the Alterations made in the Tear 1662, hand no respect to the Cavils of the Romanists	p. 2.
Mr. Ward guilty of a Falshood with respect to the Bishops who ordain'd Archbishop Parker	ibid &c.
Mr. Ward misinform'd about the Time of the publication of King Edward's Ordinal	p. 4.
The English Forms of Ordination	p. 5.
Mr. Ward's Argument against the validity of these Forms confuted	p. 7. &c.
That the Forms quoted by Mr. Ward is not the whole of our Ordinal	p. 9. &c.
Our Ordinal prov'd to be valid by the fourth Council of Carthage	p. ibid.
The English Ordinal for Priests compar'd with the Romish	p. 10.
Cardinal Bellarmine and the Council of Trent against Mr. Ward in the Matter and Form of Ordination	p. 11.
The English and the Romish Ordinal for Bishops compar'd	p. 15.
The primitive Forms and the English the same, as to the essentials of Ordination	p. 20, 21, &c.
The Alterations made in the English Ordinals, in the Tear 1662, no Argument of their Invalidity before that Time	p. 27.
The reason of these Alterations	p. 29.
Archbishop Parker's consecrators prov'd to be true Bishops	p. 34.
	Bishop

- Bishop Barlow prov'd a true Bishop by several publick Records* p. 35, &c.
Barlow concern'd in the consecration of a Bishop in Henry the Eighth's Days p. 38
The want of a Register of Barlow's consecration no Argument against his being consecrated p. 44.
Several Arguments against Parker's consecrators confuted p. 46, 47, &c.
The consecration of Ridley, Farrer and Hooper prov'd p. 50, 51.
The Romanists contrary to themselves in their Practices p. 52 53.
Cudsemus a Papist approv'd of our Orders p. 53.
Bonner approv'd of our Orders p. 54.
Pope Pius the fourth approv'd of our Orders p. ibid.
The Sorbonne approv'd of our Orders p. 56.
Dr. Fulke maintain'd our consecrations p. 57.
The Idolatry of Rome not destructive of their Ordinations p. 59.
The English Ordination legal in a Civil Sense p. 64.
Papists contradict themselves in the case of Ordination p. 66, &c.
Scory stil'd a Bishop by Bonner p. 68.
That our Bishops were legal Bishops in Eye of our Laws before the Eighth of Eliz. p. 69, 70.
The Story of the Nag's-Head consecration confuted p. 72, &c.
Neal a blind Witness at the Nag's-Head p. 80. 93.
No Witnesses at all of the Nag's-Head Business p. 81.
That the pretended Witness Neal did not tell Bonner of it, who is said to have sent him thither p. ibid.
Stow ridiculously brought in to testify the Nag's-Head Story. p. 82.
Hollingshed the same p. ibid.
The Lambeth Records pursu'd and approv'd of by Fe-suits p. 83.
They prevaricate afterwards : 'tis natural for them to do so p. 84.
 Nag's-

Nag's-Head Story inconsistent with itself p. 86.
No Writer mentions it, in all Queen Elizabeth's Reign

p. *ibid.*

Kellison said nothing of it in the Tear 1605 p. 87.

Kellison the inventor of this Story 3 Tears afterwards;
viz. Anno. 1608 p. 89.

The Puritants knew nothing of it p. *ibid.*

That there was no necessity for a consecration at the
Nag's-Head p. 91.

We had a sufficient Number of Protestant Bishops
Dr. Heylin's Account of our first Bishops Ordinations p. *ibid* &c.

p. 96.

The Lambeth Register genuine p. 97.

The Nag's-Head Story being false, the Lambeth Re-
cords must be genuine p. *ibid.*

No mention of a Conge d' Esquire in the Register p. 99.

Mr. Ward's Mistake about the Words of the Queen's
Letter Missive. p. 100.

No Chronological Errors in the Register p. 101, 107.

Mr. Ward's Blunder about a Bishop Elect p. 102.

The Queen's two Commissions no prejudice to the Lam-
beth Register p. 105.

Another Blunder of Ward's about Grindal p. 108 &c.

The different Names of the Suffragan of Bedford no
prejudice to the Lambeth Register p. 110.

A notorious untruth in Mr. Ward about the different
Dates in Mason and Bishop Godwyn p. 111.

Nothing in the Registers that is ridiculous or trifling
 p. 112, 113.

That the Registers were frequently referr'd to in Queen
Elizabeth Reign p. 114.

They were refer'd to by the Parliament of the Eighth of
Elizabeth p. *ibid.*

Archbishop Parker refer'd to them in his Book, De
Antiquitate Britannicæ Ecclesiæ p. 115.

Dr. Rainold's produc'd this Register at his Conference
with Hart p. 117.

The

*The Romanists Factions in opposing our Records, and the
Consecrations of our Bishops* p. ibid

*There was no necessity to produce Registers in Queen
Elizabeth's Days* p. 119.

*The Ordination Controversy then on another Foot from
what it is now.* p. 120.

*The Controversy of Harding and Jewel an instance of
this* p. 120, 121, &c.

*That the Clergy of the Church of England were for
Episcopacy in Queen Elizabeth's Days* p. 127.

*The Judgment of Dr. Whitaker of no Consequence in
this Debate* p. 128.

*The Judgment of the Church is to be consider'd only in
her publick Canons, Liturgies, &c.* p. ibid.

Archbishop Parker for the Divine Right of Episcopacy p. 129.

Bishop Bilson the same p. 130, &c.

*A Table of Matthew Parker's Succession from the Bi-
shops in Henry the Eighth's Days* p. 137.

F I N I S.



the
bid
een
19.
om
20.
of
cc.
for
27.
in
28.
in
id,
acy
29.
cc.
Bi-
7.